

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 87-383

H. R. 7391

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 7391	1
Digest of Public Law 87-383	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 7391

May	9, 1961	Rep. Olsen introduced H. R. 6922 which was referred to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jun.	1, 1961	Rep. Dingel introduced H. R. 7391 which was referred to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jun.	14, 1961	House committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7391.
Jun.	15, 1961	House committee reported H. R. 7391 without amendment. H. Report No. 545. Print of bill and report.
Jul.	10, 1961	House passed H. R. 7391 without amendment.
Jul.	11, 1961	H. R. 7391 was referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Aug.	8, 1961	Senate committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7391 with amendment.
Aug.	10, 1961	Senate committee reported H. R. 7391 with amendment. S. Report No. 705. Print of bill and report.
Aug.	28, 1961	Senate passed H. R. 7391 with amendments.
Sept.	7, 1961	House disagreed to Senate amendments of H. R. 7391. House conferees were appointed.
Sept.	11, 1961	Senate conferees were appointed.
Sept.	12, 1961	Conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 7391.
Sept.	14, 1961	House received the conference report. H. Report No. 1184. Print of conference report.
Sept.	23, 1961	Senate agreed to the conference report.
Sept.	25, 1961,	House agreed to the conference report.
Oct.	4, 1961	Approved: Public Law 87-383

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 87-383

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL. Authorizes appropriations of not to exceed \$105,000,000 for the seven-year period beginning with the fiscal year 1962, as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund for the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1969, are to be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund.

87TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6922

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 9, 1961

Mr. OLSEN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

A BILL

To provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed
4 to conduct an accelerated program of acquisition of land for
5 migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas.

6 SEC. 2. In addition to any other amounts authorized or
7 appropriated, there is authorized to be appropriated to the
8 migratory bird conservation fund (to be reimbursed as pro-
9 vided in section 4 of this Act) during the ten-year period
10 which begins on July 1, 1961, the sum of \$150,000,000,

1 not more than \$20,000,000 of which may be appropriated
2 for any one fiscal year. Any amounts appropriated under
3 the authority of this section shall remain available until
4 expended.

5 SEC. 3. To obtain funds for the migratory bird conserva-
6 tion fund, the Secretary of the Interior may issue and have
7 outstanding at any one time non-interest-bearing notes (to
8 be retired as provided in section 4 of this Act) for purchase
9 by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed
10 \$150,000,000, less any amounts appropriated pursuant to
11 section 2 of this Act. Not more than \$20,000,000 of such
12 notes shall be issued in any one fiscal year, and none may
13 be issued after June 30, 1971. Such notes shall be in such
14 forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be sub-
15 ject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by
16 the Secretary of the Interior with the approval of the Secre-
17 tary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is au-
18 thorized and directed to purchase any notes issued under this
19 section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public
20 debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities
21 issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and
22 the purposes for which securities may be issued under such
23 Act are extended to include any purchases of such notes.
24 The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of
25 the notes acquired by him under this section. All redemp-

1 tions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury
2 of such notes shall be treated in every respect as public
3 debt transactions of the United States.

4 SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections
5 (b) and (c) of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting
6 Stamp Act of March 14, 1934 (16 U.S.C. 918d), one-
7 half of the net income of the migratory bird conservation
8 fund received by such fund after June 30, 1971, shall be
9 applied to the retirement of any outstanding notes issued
10 pursuant to section 3 of this Act until all such notes are
11 retired, and thereafter shall be covered into the Treasury
12 as reimbursement for any appropriations made pursuant to
13 section 2 of this Act until the Treasury has been reim-
14 bursed the total amount of such appropriations.

A BILL

To provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes.

By Mr. OISEN

MAY 9, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

87TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7391

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 1, 1961

Mr. DINGELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

A BILL

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*

2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That in order to promote the conservation of migratory

4 waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of im-

5 portant wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to

6 the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized

7 to be appropriated for the ten-year period beginning with

8 fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$150,000,000.

9 SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to

10 this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for pur-

1 poses of the migratory bird conservation fund established
2 pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp
3 Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 451; 16
4 U.S.C. 718d)..

5 SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be
6 treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory
7 bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning
8 with fiscal year 1972, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of
9 the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment
10 shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum
11 of the moneys accruing annually to such fund: *Provided*,
12 That in the event the full amount authorized by section 1 of
13 this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid ten-
14 year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this
15 section shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

87TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 7391

A BILL

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DINGELL

JUNE 1, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

HOUSE

16. CENTENNIALS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 435, to provide for the recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture (H. Rept. 532), and H. J. Res. 436, to provide for the recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the national system of land-grant universities and colleges (H. Rept. 533). p. 9700
17. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Findley said "the master plan to transfer authority from Congress to the executive branch is now clear. The first example was the farm bill." pp. 9641-2
The Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Agriculture Committee voted to report "to the full committee subcommittee print, as amended, on the feed grain bill portion of H. R. 6400, general farm bill." pp. D454-5
18. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7042, to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., and H. R. 7240, to authorize an exchange of lands at Wupatki National Monument, Ariz. p. D455
The Committee passed over without prejudice H. R. 2206, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colo., and tabled H. R. 6305, to provide for the production of underground water on the public lands. p. D455
19. WILDLIFE. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. p. D456
20. TARIFFS. Rep. Robison said "our failure to do anything, this session, about the import problem will go to the very heart of our continuing ability to do so." pp. 9696-8

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Schadeberg inserting a letter from the Murphy Products Co., Burlington, Wis., opposing the proposed farm bill. p. A4351
Extension of remarks of Sen. Humphrey inserting an address by Sen. Long on the "agricultural situation, and, in particular, the farm legislation now pending before the Congress." pp. A4356-7
22. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Aspinall inserting an address by Frank M. Clinton, Bureau of Reclamation, describing the progress being made on the Upper Colorado River storage project. pp. A4357-60
23. TARIFFS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Sibal inserting an article, "Tariff Aid Program for Small Firms Proposed." p. A4372
24. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Rep. Multer inserting his statement before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee favoring legislation to repeal the so-called Hiss Act. p. A4376
25. NATIONAL PARKS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Byrd inserting an address by Conrad L. Wirth, National Park Service, "Parks for America Is Our Common Concern." pp. A4379-81

26. POULTRY; EGGS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hemphill inserting an article, "High Production A Must On Commercial Egg Farm." pp. A4392-3
27. ITEM VETO. Extension of remarks of Rep. Schwengel favoring item veto authority for the President and inserting an article, "A Way To Reduce Congressional Pork." p. A4399
28. CIVIL DEFENSE; FOOD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Weaver discussing a proposal that this Department make available to civil defense agencies in each State a sufficient food supply to handle an emergency. pp. A4405-6
29. AUTOMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Rhodes inserting an article, "Automation and Featherbedding." pp. A4412-3
30. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Laird discussing the role Wis. is playing in the production of milk and dairy products. p. A4414

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. GUAM. H. R. 7641, by Rep. Aspinall, H. R. 7642, by Rep. O'Brien of New York, H. R. 7643, by Rep. Saylor, and H. R. 7645, by Rep. Kyl, to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters; to Public Works Committee.
H. R. 7644, by Rep. Westland, to authorize Federal assistance to Guam and the American Samoa in major disasters; to Public Works Committee.
32. RECREATION. H. R. 7650, by Rep. Horan, and H. R. 7652, by Rep. May, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain Banks Lake Reservoir, Columbia Basin project, Washington, at a constant level for recreation purposes; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
33. EMPLOYMENT. H. R. 7640, by Rep. King, Cal., to provide for the establishment of a permanent program of additional unemployment compensation to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program, etc.; to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9664-9
34. INSECT CONTROL. H. R. 7649, by Rep. Henderson, to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
35. LIVESTOCK. H. R. 7654, by Rep. Clem Miller, to provide for tariff import quotas on sheep, lambs, mutton and lamb; to Ways and Means Committee.
36. WOOL LABELING H. R. 7661, by Rep. Dague, to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to exclude from the provisions of that act wool products with respect to which the disclosure of wool fiber content is not necessary for the protection of the consumer; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
37. TRANSPORTATION. S. 2078, by Sen. Magnuson (by request), to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide that the transportation of bulk commodities by railroad shall be exempt from regulation; to Commerce Committee.

The Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 2555, to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the U. S. in cases of emergency evacuations in oversea areas. p. D464

12. WILDLIFE. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat (H.Rept 545).
~~The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7678, "relating to the importation of wild animals and wild birds," p. D465~~
13. PUBLIC DEBT. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7677, "to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit." p. D465
14. FARM PROGRAM. The Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the Agriculture Committee "met in executive session to review a report on farm cost-price squeeze, and ordered it printed with minor changes." p. D463
15. EDUCATION. The Select Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 4386, to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education. p.D463
16. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the conference report on S. 610, on international tourism, the fourth supplemental appropriation bill for 1961, and the Consent Calendar will be considered on Mon., the Private Calendar will be called on Tues., and on Wed. the housing bill will be considered. pp. 9728-9
17. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 19. p. 9749

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. HOUSING. Rep. Alger inserted a newspaper editorial, "House Without Foundation," criticizing the administration's housing bill. pp. A4438-9
19. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Alger stating that "the best weapon we have against communism is a sound and growing economy in the United States and that goal cannot be maintained so long as we continue to spend, without regard to any sense of responsibility, billions of dollars on foreign aid." p. A4443
20. WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Kuchel stating that Calif. has had the worst drought in 30 years and inserting an editorial, "The Drought of 1961." p. A4444
21. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Byrnes inserting a speech by Robert C. Tyson "warning us that economic incentive, upon which our growth and progress in a free economy depends, is being stifled by governmental action." pp. A4477-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

22. ANIMAL DISEASES. H. R. 7694, by Rep. Matthews, and H. R. 7702, by Rep. Blitch, to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program; to Agriculture Committee.
23. PUBLIC DEBT. H. R. 7677, by Rep. Mills, to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to Ways and Means Committee.
24. WATER. H. R. 7690, by Rep. Teague, Tex., to amend the Water Supply Act of 1958 to remove certain restrictions in that act; to Public Works Committee.
25. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. S. 2081, by Sen. Dirksen, to provide for the establishment of a regional research center for rural redevelopment; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9754-6
26. EMPLOYMENT. S. 2084, by Sen. McCarthy, to provide for the establishment of a permanent program of additional unemployment compensation, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program, etc.; to Finance Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9756-65
27. RECREATION. S. 2086, by Sen. Jackson, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin Project for recreation purposes are nonreimbursable to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
28. FOREIGN TRADE. S. 2092, by Sen. Johnston (by request), to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
29. RESEARCH STATION. S. 2093, by Sen. Mundt, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to macadamize a portion of road leading to the U. S. Department of Agriculture field station outside the town of Newell, S. Dak.; to Public Works Committee.

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

June 16: Recognition of State water rights of western States, S. Interior. Supplemental appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec).

Proposed Youth Opportunities Act (including Youth Conservation Corps), H. Education and Labor.

Foreign aid bill, S. Foreign Relations (exec) and H. Foreign Affairs (exec).

June 19: Proposed Youth Opportunities Act (including Youth Conservation Corps), H. Education and Labor (Secretary Freeman to testify).

oOo

PROMOTING THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL BY THE ACQUISITION OF WETLANDS AND OTHER ESSENTIAL WATERFOWL HABITAT

JUNE 15, 1961.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BONNER, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 7391]

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is the preservation of our immensely valuable waterfowl resources. As a result of the continued increase in population, with its attendant development of hitherto untouched lands for residential, commercial and agricultural purposes, the area available for the breeding and development of waterfowl has steadily shrunk. Originally, there were some 127 million acres of wetlands in the United States. Now but 22.5 million acres are of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. In view of the fact that a safe minimum for the preservation of the various species is 12.5 million acres, of which the Federal Government would hold 4.5 million and the States the balance, the point of no return is rapidly approaching.

Land acquisition in the past has been financed largely through the sale of migratory bird hunting stamps—the so-called duck stamp—to hunters. Prior to 1958, a considerable part of the revenue from the sale of such stamps, which runs from \$4 to \$6 million per year, was diverted to other uses. In that year the committee approved a bill which was enacted into law by which after July 1, 1960, the entire proceeds of the stamps would be used for land acquisition and enforce-

ment of regulations. But, as stated, the annual revenue from this source amounts to but \$4 to \$6 million and the total cost of achievement of the goal of acquisition of 4.5 million acres will be about \$200 million. At the present rate of acquisition, suitable land will have been diverted to other uses or its cost will have risen to such an extent that as a practical matter, it will be lost long before funds are sufficient for its purchase. It is for this reason that the bill authorizes the appropriation over a 10-year period beginning in 1962 of \$150 million for this purpose. This sum, with the anticipated revenue of about \$50 million from the sale of duck stamps during that period, will make available the \$200 million believed to be necessary to preserve the resource. Under the terms of the bill, 75 percent of the proceeds of duck stamps would thereafter be returned to the Treasury until the \$150 million is repaid. While the bill specifically provides that no interest would be payable on the advances made, the subcommittee believes that the public benefits from the preservation of the resource justify placing the interest burden upon the public. This has been the practice in reclamation projects for many years and the benefits that inure to local communities visited by sportsmen in their quest for waterfowl far more than offset the interest charge.

The bill, originally introduced as H.R. 4603, was modified by the committee in accordance with ideas expressed by the Department of the Interior, witnesses, and members of the committee. This present bill embodies their views. The committee believes that the bill is necessary for the preservation of our wildlife and directly or indirectly will prove of benefit to everyone in the United States.

In addition to this bill, the following members introduced identical legislation:

Hon. Henry S. Reuss (H.R. 4624).

Hon. Lester R. Johnson (H.R. 6133).

Hon. Arnold Olsen (H.R. 6922).

Hon. Clem Miller (H.R. 7153).

A bill on the same subject (H.R. 7062) was introduced by Hon. Thomas M. Pelly.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

Departmental reports on H.R. 4603 are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1961.

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. BONNER: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 4603, a bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes. This report is applicable also to the identical bills, H.R. 4624 and H.R. 6133.

We urge that this proposed legislation be revised and enacted in accordance with the attached redraft thereof. Such draft incorporates certain changes that are self-explanatory and which we feel are desirable in carrying out the object of this proposal.

This proposal will authorize a significant and highly desirable program of land acquisition for the benefit of the Nation's migratory waterfowl. We believe that it will provide a practicable means of stepping up such land acquisition activities, with the ultimate costs thereof being financed with duck stamp revenues. This is generally consistent with the policy already established by the Congress for the use of such revenues.

Such a program is desirable, we believe, due to the fact that various factors—our rapidly increasing human population, continuing urban and industrial expansion, as well as various agricultural and other land drainage programs and activities—are having a very adverse effect upon our migratory waterfowl, i.e., principally ducks and geese. Marshes and swamps have been ditched, dredged, drained, burned, filled, paved, and polluted to meet the demands of modern civilization for more agricultural lands, more industrial sites, more urban housing developments, more roads, and more airports, et cetera.

It is significant to note that there were originally in the 48 contiguous States some 127 million acres of wetlands; however, by 1955 this total acreage was reduced to approximately 74 million acres. Of this amount only 22.5 million are now of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. Each year this acreage shrinks considerably. Time is running out in the race to preserve our migratory waterfowl. These factors are reducing the natural habitat available to our migratory waterfowl and are creating an urgent need for well-considered counter-measures. The only solution, we believe, is an expansion in the Federal land acquisition program for the benefit of our migratory waterfowl resource. Unless appropriate action is taken soon, very serious losses to this resource will result.

Although considerable areas of wetlands and other suitable waterfowl habitat are still available in certain places, opportunities for acquisition thereof are disappearing rapidly. Pressures for other use and development of these areas are increasing. Land costs have continued to rise. In carrying forward our refuge acquisition program, we are handicapped frequently by a lack of sufficient funds with which to acquire, when they become available, many of the excellent properties that are needed for these purposes.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, it should be noted that an important step has been made toward accomplishment of the goal that we are convinced is desirable in providing adequately for our migratory waterfowl population. The Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, as amended by the act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 486; 16 U.S.C. 718d.), requires that beginning on July 1, 1960, all net revenues from duck stamp sales be used for the purchase or lease of lands for these purposes. We expect future revenues from this source to range from \$5 to \$6 million each year; however, because of the adverse factors previously indicated, we must emphasize that these duck stamp revenues will be grossly inadequate. They will permit only very gradual acquisition of the needed properties. Consequently, an accelerated land acquisition program is urgently needed in order that we may obtain, while they are still available, those important wetlands and other wildlife habitat areas that are essential for our migratory waterfowl.

This proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed \$20 million a year over a 10-year period; however, it should

be noted that under the terms of this bill, these funds would be paid back out of duck stamp revenues, beginning in 1972. Our proposed revision would eliminate the annual limitation which we believe is unnecessary. Appropriations made during the 10-year period, when merged with the duck stamp revenues may be expected to provide a total of some \$200 million during the 10-year period. In order to carry out this program in the manner and scale that we believe it should be carried out, we estimated that 10 million could be obligated for land acquisition in fiscal year 1962; \$12 million in 1963; \$19 million in 1964; \$23 million in 1965; \$25 million in 1966-67; \$23 million in 1968, and \$21 million in 1969-71. We anticipate that such expenditures would be sufficient to acquire title or lease approximately 3,960,000 acres of waterfowl lands. We would expect to acquire title to approximately 2,810,000 acres and to lease or acquire easements to approximately 1,150,000 acres. This amount of acquisition and control of land for waterfowl conservation purposes would comprise 88 percent of the total of 4.5 million acres that we consider to be a desirable ultimate goal for such acquisition by the Federal Government. At the end of the 10-year period we would expect to continue land acquisition with 25 percent of the duck stamp revenues, as indicated under the terms of our suggested revision, until the remaining acreage is obtained. The remaining portion of the duck stamp revenues, 75 percent under the terms of our redraft, would be used for repayment of the funds advanced for land acquisition.

The need for Federal and State cooperation and progressive action in perpetuating the Nation's waterfowl resources has become generally recognized. Public ownership or control of 12.5 million acres of key wetlands in the 48 contiguous States is highly desirable. It is essential that these lands be properly distributed throughout the nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. This Department now manages some 3.5 million acres for this purpose and the States manage some 2 million acres of suitable waterfowl land. Under the Federal-State program that we envision, the Federal Government would acquire the additional lands to which we have referred previously in the amount of 4.5 million acres, and the States would acquire the remaining additional 2.5 million acres, thereby bringing the total acreage under public management for waterfowl resource conservation up to 12.5 million acres.

So far as Federal expenditures are concerned, the income from the \$3 duck stamp, which is earmarked for this land acquisition program, will repay the cost of the Federal portion of such program, as indicated by the terms of this proposed legislation. In this connection, you will note that our suggested revision contains a provision that will permit an increase in the cost of the duck stamp to \$4 after the first \$50 million has been advanced, unless the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of pertinent factors, determines that such an increase is unwarranted and contrary to the public interest. A similar \$1 increase in the price of the duck stamp would be made after the advancement of the second \$50 million unless the Secretary finds that such an increase is not in the public interest.

We anticipate full cooperation by the States in carrying forward this program. We believe this proposal is in the public interest because it will permit Federal acquisition of these important waterfowl lands while they are still available and at less cost than would be the case if such acquisition is carried out over a long period of time.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A BILL To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$150 million: *Provided,* That following the appropriation of the first \$50 million pursuant to this Act, for each migratory-bird hunting stamp sold under the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 718b, there shall be collected by the Post Office Department the sum of four dollars unless the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of all pertinent factors relating to the conservation of migratory waterfowl and related considerations, determines that such an increase is unwarranted and contrary to the public interest; in which event, public notice of such determination shall be issued by the Secretary. A copy of such notice shall be furnished to the Postmaster General by the Secretary for his information. Similarly, following the appropriation of the second \$50 million, the price then existing of the said migratory-bird hunting stamp shall be increased one dollar unless the Secretary of the Interior shall make a determination to the contrary in accordance with the aforesaid procedure. Any revenue obtained from the increase in the price of the said stamp during the ten-year period for which appropriations may be made hereunder shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited toward repayment of the funds advanced hereunder.

SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for purposes of the migratory bird conservation fund established pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended, (48 Stat. 451; 16 U.S.C. 718d.).

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1972, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 percent of the moneys accruing annually to such fund: *Provided,* That in the event the full amount authorized by section 1 of this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid ten-year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 22, 1961.

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 4603 to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes.

The only provision of the bill of primary interest to this Department is section 3, which would authorize the Secretary of Interior to issue noninterest-bearing notes in an amount not to exceed \$150 million for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in order to obtain funds for the migratory bird conservation fund.

The Department would be opposed to the foregoing provision. The Department generally looks with disfavor upon providing funds for Federal programs through the device of so-called back-door financing rather than by the regular appropriation process. When that device is used, it is usually limited to revenue-producing programs, such as Federal direct loan programs where the loans made from the proceeds of Treasury borrowing are repayable with interest. The funds that would be obtained pursuant to section 3 of the bill would be used for a nonrevenue purpose, i.e., the acquisition of land, and the Department is of the opinion that the necessary funds in such a case should be obtained by direct appropriations.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

R. H. KNIGHT, *General Counsel.*

This bill would make no changes in existing law.



87TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7391

[Report No. 545]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 1, 1961

Mr. DINGELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

JUNE 15, 1961

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That in order to promote the conservation of migratory
4 waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of im-
5 portant wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to
6 the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized
7 to be appropriated for the ten-year period beginning with
8 fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$150,000,000.

9 SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to
10 this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for pur-

1 poses of the migratory bird conservation fund established
2 pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp
3 Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 451; 16
4 U.S.C. 718d).

5 SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be
6 treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory
7 bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning
8 with fiscal year 1972, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of
9 the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment
10 shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum
11 of the moneys accruing annually to such fund: *Provided*,
12 That in the event the full amount authorized by section 1 of
13 this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid ten-
14 year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this
15 section shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

87TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7391

[Report No. 545]

A BILL

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DINGELL

JUNE 1, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

JUNE 15, 1961

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

10. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Passed without amendment S. 1720, to make permanent the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 11315
11. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment S. 537, to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 11322
Passed without amendment S. 796, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 11316
12. PUBLICATIONS. Passed without amendment S. 540, to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 11316
13. ASSISTANT SECRETARIES. Reps. Gross, Weaver, and Ford, objected to the consideration of H. R. 6882, to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, and the bill was stricken from the Consent Calendar. p. 11312
14. MIGRATORY WATERFOWL. Passed without amendment H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. pp. 11358-62
15. PERSONNEL. Passed over without prejudice H. R. 7043, to amend the salary retention provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 so as to include statutory salary increases in the retained rates of employees involved in downgradings, and to make ineligible for salary retention protection an employee whose reduction to his existing grade is a condition of his temporary promotion to a higher grade. p. 11314
Passed over without prejudice H. R. 2555, to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the U. S. in cases of emergency evacuations in overseas areas. p. 11317
16. PUBLIC LANDS; FORESTRY. Passed as reported H. R. 6067, to provide for an appropriation of not to exceed \$35,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Blue Ridge Parkway at Tennessee Bald or Beech Gap southwest and running into Georgia (the proposed parkway would traverse certain national forest lands). pp. 11320-1
Passed without amendment H. R. 7042, to add 1,040 acres of land in the Lassen National Forest to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif. p. 11322
17. GRAPES AND PLUMS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6253, to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums (H. Rept. 682). p. 11378
18. IRRIGATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7596, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project (H. Rept. 685). p. 11379

19. VOCATIONAL RETRAINING. Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserted an article, "The Hard Realities of Retraining." pp. 11366-8

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

20. PRICES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Capehart inserting an article, "Who's To Blame For The High Cost Of Living?" p. A5075
21. EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Ford inserting an editorial embodying a statement by Rep. Griffin on "back-door spending." pp. A5075-6
22. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel inserting an editorial criticizing the proposed farm bill. p. A5086
Extension of remarks of Rep. Rousselot stating that "stories about extravagant agricultural subsidies are legion," and inserting an article, "Farmer Buys Cadillac To Rib Crop Control." p. A5087
Extension of remarks of Rep. Conte inserting an editorial, "The Freeman Wailing Wall." p. A5104
Extension of remarks of Rep. Beckworth inserting various tabulations on price support loans, and the number of farms reporting harvested acres. pp. A5132-40
Extension of remarks of Rep. Derwinski criticizing the proposed farm bill and inserting two articles on this subject. p. A5140
23. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hartke inserting five prize winning essays on "What Rural Electrification Means To My Community." pp. A5094-7
Extension of remarks of Rep. Hollifield favoring and Rep. Hosmer opposing the proposed provision in the AEC authorization bill to establish the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash. pp. A5099-103, A5130-2
24. ECONOMICS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hartke inserting Labor Secretary Goldberg's letter commenting on the administration's economic programs and stating that it is "an answer to political charges that they are retreads and modifications of old programs." p. A5109
25. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Albert inserting an article, "Foreign Aid -- Persuasive Reasons for Approval." p. A5125
26. RESEARCH. Extension of remarks of Sen. Smith inserting an outline of the study made by the National Science Foundation as to national needs in scientific research and education during the next 10 years. pp. A5126-7

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. LANDS. S. 2213, by Sen. Gruening (for himself and Sen. Bartlett), to convey the interest of the United States in certain land to the city of Sitka, Alaska; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
S. 2219, by Sen. Bible (by request), to authorize the classification, segregation, lease, and sale of public land for urban, business, and occupancy sites to repeal obsolete statutes; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
28. RESEARCH. H. R. 8046, by Rep. St. George, to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to Science and Astronautics Committee.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Kilburn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 857) to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore, a similar bill to the one the House just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this an effort to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. No, just the opposite, to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUTHERFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 857 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5786 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUTHERFORD: Strike out the preamble of S. 857.

The amendment was agreed to. time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent the proceedings whereby the bill H.R. 5786 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD just prior to the passage of the bill H.R. 5786.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (S. 576) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126), is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"SEC. 216. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to establish and maintain the United States Maritime Service as a voluntary organization for the training of citizens of the United States to serve as licensed and unlicensed personnel on American merchant vessels. The Secretary is authorized to determine the number of persons to be enrolled for training and reserve purposes in the said Service, to fix the rates of pay and allowances of such persons, and to prescribe such courses and periods of training as, in his discretion, are necessary to maintain a trained and efficient merchant marine personnel. The ranks, grades, and ratings for personnel of the said Service shall be the same as are now or shall hereafter be prescribed for the personnel of the Coast Guard. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe, by rules and regulations, the uniform of the Service and rules governing the wearing and furnishing of such uniform of persons in the Service."

(2) By adding at the end of the section, two new subsections to read as follows:

"(e) To effectuate the purpose of this section, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to employ professors, lecturers, and instructors and to compensate them without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(f) On such date as may be fixed by the Civil Service Commission with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, not later than one year from the date of enactment of this subsection, persons then serving as administrative enrollees shall be brought into the competitive civil service or excepted civil service in accordance with the Civil Service Act and rules, and shall thereafter be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except as otherwise authorized by subsection (e) of this section or other provisions of law, and shall be subject to other laws of general applicability to civilian employees of the United States, subject to the following exceptions and conditions, notwithstanding any other provisions of law:

"(1) The rate of basic compensation of any person serving as administrative enrollee on the date immediately preceding the date specified in the first sentence of this subsection (f) shall upon conversion provided for in this subsection be fixed at a rate which is not less than the combined basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances received immediately preceding conversion, or the value of such allowances when furnished the person in kind at the rate and in the amounts theretofore authorized by regulation for such allowances. In the case of any such person whose combined basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances, or value thereof when furnished in kind, exceeds the entrance rate of the grade or level in which his position is placed, the basic compensation of such person shall be fixed at that step in the grade or level which is equal to, or if none be equal, which represents the next higher regular or longevity step or level over

the person's combined pay and allowances, as specified above, received immediately preceding the date of conversion. In any case in which no such rate exists in the grade of his position, his rate of basic compensation shall be fixed at the next regular salary rate which is not less than his combined basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances, or value thereof when furnished in kind. For the purposes of determining eligibility for step increases following conversion, the basic compensation as an administrative enrollee prior to conversion shall be considered as the total amount or value of basic pay, subsistence, and quarters allowances. Any adjustment in compensation required by this subsection shall not be considered to be an equivalent increase in compensation for the purpose of a periodic step increase, nor an increase in grade or rate of basic compensation for the purpose of a longevity step increase.

"(2) The rate of basic compensation authorized by this paragraph shall continue until the person is separated from his position or receives a higher rate of basic compensation by operation of law or regulation.

"(3) Any person who, as a result of the action required under the first sentence of this subsection (f), becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2061 and the following), shall be credited under that Act with all annual leave remaining to his credit as an administrative enrollee, at the rate of five-sevenths of a day of leave chargeable under the Act (5 U.S.C. 2064) for each calendar day of leave remaining to the credit of the enrollee, without regard to the limitations on maximum leave accumulation provided by the Act, and shall be credited with thirteen days of sick leave in addition to any leave recredit to which the employee may otherwise be entitled.

"(4) Active service of any administrative enrollee performed prior to the date specified in the first sentence of this subsection (f) shall be considered creditable as civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for all purposes, except that in computing length of service for the purpose of title VII of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, continuous service immediately preceding the date established under the first sentence of this subsection (f) shall be counted either (1) toward one step increase under section 701, or (2) toward one longevity step increase under section 703, as the case may be.

"(5) Persons converted from their status as administrative enrollees to positions by or pursuant to this subsection (f) shall not be entitled, upon conversion or subsequent separation from such position, to payment of travel and transportation expenses which otherwise may be authorized under the joint travel regulations on separation from the United States Maritime Service; nor shall such persons upon conversion to positions by or pursuant to this subsection be entitled to free medical, dental, surgical, and hospital care under section 322(6) of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 696; 42 U.S.C. 249)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a definite status for the faculty at the Merchant Marine Academy.

At the present time, the majority of the faculty are employees of the Maritime Service and wear the uniforms of that service. At the same time, by ruling of the Civil Service Commission, a great part of their rights are governed by civil service regulations. This bill would place them under full civil service status without loss of any rights or privileges that they presently enjoy.

The faculty members would be placed under the exempt clause in the same status as the civilian instructors at the Naval Academy. It would give greater freedom to the administration in recruiting qualified instructors.

The bill has the approval of the Academic Advisory Board of Academy, which Board consists of prominent educators throughout the United States and they have expressed the view that the establishment of a permanent status would be most beneficial to the educational standards of the institution.

An identical bill, H.R. 5383 passed the House during the closing days of the 86th Congress, that is on August 22, 1960, and there was not sufficient time for its consideration in the Senate.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few lone voices in the wilderness with respect to this bill, S. 576.

This Academy is in my congressional district. As one of the great academies we have, I feel that putting the Academy under civil service, as is proposed by the current bill, is ill-advised action to take. Imagine, if you will, an almost total military academy being run by job descriptions from a bureaucratic desk in Washington, and you have the effect of this bill.

I feel this Academy, which has tremendous possibilities in this nuclear age, will suffer by being run from Washington by people who sit at a desk in the Nation's Capital and punch out these job descriptions. All of the military discipline that we have there today will slowly disappear, in my opinion, with a resulting lack of esprit de corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this bill. I have been opposed to it since I represented the Second Congressional District of New York. I know you cannot fight city hall. You could not fight it last year and you cannot fight it this year. I will not ask for a rollcall, but I just want to voice my opposition on it, since it is a subject dear to my heart in my congressional district.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical to the one which the House approved last year on August 22. There was not sufficient time in the session to permit the Senate to act upon it, and for that reason the bill came back to our committee and now is on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to understand what the situation is with respect to the Merchant Marine Acad-

emy. The Academy, plus a number of marine training schools, was established during World War II for the purpose of training personnel for the ships we were building in behalf of the war effort. After the war was over and over a period of time, all of the training institutions were closed with the exception of the one at Kings Point. Kings Point and these other institutions were operated by a branch of the Maritime Administration known as the Maritime Service. The people in the maritime service had sort of a military status and were entitled to wear the uniform and to draw pay and advantages similar to those of the other military organizations. However, the people in the maritime service owed no obligation whatsoever to the Government. They could quit at any time, and in recent years it has become evident that we ought to change the administrative setup in the Academy and make it similar to that which exists in the Military Academies. Incidentally, the bill was approved unanimously by our committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], made his views known to the committee this year as well as last year, but the committee felt, however with due respect for his point of view, that we ought to go ahead with the proposal and, as I have indicated, make the Maritime Academy operate similarly to the Military Academies; in other words, place the civilian instructors in civil-service status the same as exists in the Military Academies, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Now, the gentleman from New York fears that this system will not operate in the Maritime Academy, but it seems to me that the experience of the Military Academies indicates clearly that the system will work. Placing the instructors, the civilian instructors, under civil-service status gives them more job security and tenure than would otherwise be the case, and it would have a tendency, it seems to me, to keep and attract the better type of instructor. Last year this measure was put to a vote under suspension of the rules, and the House approved it by a vote of about 290 to 90; in other words, by a percentage of better than 3 to 1. It seems to me that this is a step forward. It has the approval of the Department, and I urge the House to adopt the bill.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 576.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the ten-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$150,000,000.

Sec. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for purposes of the migratory bird conservation fund established pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 451; 16 U.S.C. 718d).

Sec. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1972, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum of the moneys accruing annually to such fund: *Provided*, That in the event the full amount authorized by section 1 of this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid ten-year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 7391, was reported unanimously from the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was also reported unanimously by the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to pay appropriate tribute to my colleagues who sponsored similar or identical legislation: Mr. REUSS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PELLY of Washington, Mr. ELLSWORTH of Kansas, and Mr. GOODELL, of Pennsylvania. They have expressed deep and abiding interest in this subject, and have sponsored similar or identical legislation. Without the help of these able and distinguished conservationists and without the help of my colleagues on the com-

mittee as well as the subcommittee which considered this legislation, this bill would not have reached the floor of the House.

This bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee.

This is a simple measure, and its passage is absolutely necessary in order to save American migratory waterfowl. It provides for loans of \$150 million over a 10-year period to purchase 88 percent of the remaining 4.5 million acres of wetlands which represents the Federal share remaining of the 12.5 million acres needed to provide adequate refuge areas for feeding, resting, and wintering of our waterfowl. The States are to acquire some 2.5 million acres, and the balance of this some 5 million acres is now in public ownership.

Under the present law, duck stamp receipts amounting to some \$4,836,000 are earmarked for refuge acquisition, except for administrative costs. This will require some 30-odd years to complete our refuge acquisition program.

Unfortunately, there is simply not enough time to complete our program in the time remaining to us during which the lands and open space will remain available.

It is also worth while to note that our lands are going so fast that probably by the conclusion of the 10-year program there will be little land available to the Federal Government for the continuation of the program.

Funds which will be spent will go through the regular appropriation channels, and I want to stress that. There is no back-door appropriation here.

At the completion of 10 years, three-fourths of the annual receipts of the duck stamp funds will be earmarked for repayment which will continue on out of duck stamp receipts until the total of \$150 million has been repaid to the Treasury.

Our migratory waterfowl face a future which is extremely dark. Each year a million acres of open space vanish under houses, factories, streets, drive-ins, parking lots, and so forth. Of 127 million acres of wetlands in the continental United States at the time of Columbus, 80 percent is now gone forever by reason of drainage. In one State alone 5 percent of the remaining marshland vanished in a period of less than 4 years. Half of the waterfowl production in the prairie States had vanished.

The Department of the Interior estimates that the funds authorized can be expended as follows: \$10 million in 1962, \$12 million in 1963, \$19 million in 1964, \$23 million in 1965, \$25 million in 1966 and 1967, \$23 million in 1968, and for the period of 1969, 1970, and 1971, \$21 million—2.8 million acres will be acquired in fee and 1.5 million acres will be acquired by lease and easement. The regular duck-stamp receipts will provide approximately \$50 million over the 10 years and will acquire the remaining 200,000 acres of land contemplated by this program.

Our migratory waterfowl face the darkest hour in their history. I am advised by reputable biologists that if the

Department of the Interior does what it should there will probably be no season or at least the most abbreviated of seasons during this year.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I just wanted to make it crystal clear that this money that will be advanced for this purpose will be paid back out of the duck stamp money, which is money collected from the sportsmen through the sale of duck stamps. This is not money that is coming out of the Federal Treasury. The money will continue to be collected. This merely provides \$150 million to do this job now when it can be done cheaply. It means no additional revenue taken away from the people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who was a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is it not true that ever since the enactment of the duck-stamp law back in the thirties much of the money that should have gone to protecting the waterfowl of this country has gone to running the Department?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. The gentleman and I were cosponsors of that change in the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the passage of H.R. 7391, as it provides for the establishment of a very necessary crash program for the Federal acquisition of lands for migratory bird refuges and waterfowl nesting areas. Earlier in the session, I joined my colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman HENRY REUSS, the gentleman from Montana, Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN, and the gentleman from California, Congressman CLEM MILLER, in introducing this legislation in the House.

If our dwindling duck population is to be saved, Congress must act now to speed up the purchase of waterfowl wetlands. In 1954, I exposed the diversion of the bulk of income from Federal duck-stamp fees to purposes other than wetlands acquisition, for which hunters had voluntarily accepted the fee in the first place. During the next 4 years, I battled for legislation to insure that all income from the stamps would go to provide more refuges for migratory waterfowl. This legislation was enacted into law in 1958.

However, even though all duck-stamp money is now earmarked for the purchase of wetlands, it will take years for the program to reach the anticipated goal of 4,400,000 acres. Meanwhile, many areas suitable for acquisition will have been drained or converted to other uses, and land prices will most likely have become prohibitively high. The next 10 years are the critical period. Wetlands must be acquired now, or it will be too late to save continental flights of waterfowl.

As every duck hunter knows, waterfowl hunting has grown poorer in recent years, and fewer hunters have taken to the field. As a result, duck stamp sales have lagged. During the 1960 fiscal year, only 1,628,365 Federal duck stamps were sold. This figure is 741,575 below the number sold during the peak year of 1955.

Mr. Speaker, with fewer duck stamps being sold, less money has been available for the purchase of new refuges. This, in turn, has resulted in poorer hunting, fewer hunters, smaller duck stamp receipts and a further lag in the acquisition program.

Enactment into law of H.R. 7391 would break this vicious circle by authorizing a loan of \$150 million from the U.S. Treasury over the next 10 years to purchase the needed property. Starting in fiscal 1972, the money would be repaid to the Treasury from duck stamp revenues.

This buy-now-pay-later plan will enable the Nation to safeguard its wetlands during the critical decade of the 1960's and preserve for coming generations our immensely valuable waterfowl resources. And by creating the wetlands, we shall also be creating the means to repay the purchase-loan money, for more wetlands will mean better hunting, more hunters and increased duck stamp sales.

Mr. Speaker, when the National Wildlife Federation held its 25th annual meeting in Washington, D.C., this year, the delegates adopted a series of resolutions that included a priority program on objectives of major conservation importance.

Significantly enough, the first item on that priority list was the establishment of a "crash" program for the acquisition of waterfowl wetlands by way of a loan such as the one proposed in the measure we are now considering.

During the 1930's, flocks of prairie chickens were a common sight in my home district in Wisconsin. Today, you have to look a long time to find a prairie chicken in my State—or anywhere in the country. If we are to save our migratory waterfowl from a similar fate, we must act now to speed up the purchase of wetlands for ducks and geese to nest and rest.

Our new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, has said that the necessity to meet the outdoor needs of our people now and in the future will in all likelihood be the sharpest and most consistent pressure on our land, water and forests in the years ahead. It is our responsibility to see to it that there will be sufficient outdoor recreational areas available to our increasing population so that our children and their children may enjoy the outdoor opportunities which we have had.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell me anyone from the Department who appeared before the hearings and made any statement about

the acquisition of lands in South Carolina?

Mr. DINGELL. We did not go into specific areas in which the lands would be purchased by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and the Department of the Interior. I would assume that some land in the gentleman's State will be purchased under this program.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. DINGELL. There are several things the gentleman should bear carefully in mind in connection with this program. First, in the history of this program in only very few instances has there been acquisition of land by other than negotiated purchase. In other words, the power of condemnation, which is inherent in the program and already provided in the basic statute, is practically never used as a matter of policy because it is easier and cheaper to get the land by negotiated sale. It is possible to find substantially identical areas, so they do not need to go into this business of actually purchasing by condemnation. I am sure this would meet the bulk of the gentleman's objections.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot find anything which was said about purchasing land in South Carolina. Can the gentleman offer any assurance about that?

Mr. DINGELL. I cannot offer the gentleman any assurance. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] is on the floor. He is a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and perhaps he can answer the gentleman.

Mr. KARSTEN. We discussed this matter earlier. I contacted the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission which, as you know, makes purchases of land for waterfowl refuges, and we have no proposal to purchase any land in the area the gentleman mentions.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KARSTEN. I know the gentleman has in mind certain areas. We have a policy of not going in and condemning land. We do that only as a last resort. It runs up the prices of the land and creates many other problems. We try to avoid that.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am a member of this committee, but I do not recall any discussion about specific pieces of land under prospect of purchase.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have a question, and I want the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is on the Commission, to hear this.

Is it not the policy of this Commission to advise a Member of Congress of the prospective purchase of land in his area and, if there is objection, is it not the policy of the Commission to permit the Member of Congress in that area to testify before the Commission?

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. KARSTEN. The Commission has no formal policy in that regard, but informally, however, they generally consult with the Member of Congress in whose district the proposed refuge is to be located. Under the procedure that is followed, the Congressman is invited to speak for or against it or to present any information that he may have.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Is it not also the policy of the Commission that the land they buy for these refuges are submarginal lands and inexpensive land and that they do not buy land which is habitable by people and they do not buy land that is good for recreational purposes for people. When the land gets to \$500 or \$1,000 an acre, they let human beings occupy that land, but the land that is covered by water is left for the birds?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KARSTEN. We like to buy land as economically as possible. Sometimes we do have to spend more than we like to, but generally we are able to buy refuge lands at very low prices.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This land is bought by negotiation and not by just going in and condemning it?

Mr. KARSTEN. That is the general procedure.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And you will not go into a community and just take the people's property without considering these questions.

Mr. KARSTEN. We secure reports from the State Conservation Commissions, local sportsmen, and conservation organizations, as well as others, before we begin to talk about it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think it would be wrong if these people were to go in there and just ruthlessly run over the local people. Of course, that is not the testimony before our committee, and I think the gentleman should have the benefit of that discussion because I do not think that is the record of this Commission.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his good explanation of this bill and tell him I am heartily in favor of the bill and hope that it passes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

(Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include some newspaper articles.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending bill which simply accelerates the acquisition of duck and goose breeding grounds, a program that has been in operation for some time. The acquisition of these grounds is currently financed by the purchase of duck stamps by hunters. The Dingell bill continues this method of financing the program, but speeds it up for various reasons, among them being the fact that land values continue

to rise over a period of time as well as for other reasons. For example, this summer the northern plains areas where ducks and geese breed and grow up are subject to a terrible drought. I have here two news items about the drought which I will insert in my remarks. One is an Associated Press item appearing in the Kansas City Star of July 6, 1961, entitled, "Drought in North Widens."

The article is as follows:

DROUGHT IN NORTH WIDENS—PARCHED REGION SPREADS TO UPPER WISCONSIN AND AID IS SOUGHT FOR NINE MORE COUNTIES IN MINNESOTA—FEED CROPS WILTED—IN THE EASTERN MONTANA AREA MANY FIELDS WILL NOT BE HARVESTED

Northern Wisconsin today was added to the drought-ridden Great Plains area as Minnesota sought addition of 9 counties to the 24 already declared Federal disaster tracts.

In the western Dakotas, stockmen joined crop growers in deep concern over dwindling water supplies. They were moving cattle to greener pastures or preparing for early marketing.

A GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE

Grasshoppers were added to the drought plague in eastern Montana, where Federal-State crop-reporting services predicted many fields wouldn't even be harvested.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, called for early action by Federal authorities to aid farmers in that State's drought area. Unless there is rain soon, WILEY said, farmers all over Wisconsin will be suffering.

Minnesota's Gov. Elmer L. Andersen said the worsening drought is bringing new appeals to his office daily from farmers whose pastures are browned over by the searing sun and whose feed grain crops are wilted.

WOULD INCLUDE 33 COUNTIES

Granting of the new disaster appeals would place 33 of Minnesota's 87 counties in the emergency category.

In North Dakota, water was drying up in wells, creeks, and ponds, threatening stock along the western and southern boundaries. There has been no growth of pastures or wild hay in the western two-thirds for weeks.

With temperatures in the high 80's again yesterday, much small grain was reported beyond salvage. But corn and soybeans in the eastern zones were accorded a chance, assuming some moisture does come. All of North Dakota was declared a disaster area last week.

MOVE CATTLE HERDS

Western South Dakota cattlemen were reported either moving herds to greener pastures and water or holding dispersal sales, disposing of all but foundation stock.

Charles Govern, cattle expert with the South St. Paul (Minn.) Commission Co., said the unseasonable marketing forced by the aridity was bound to carry prices downward. But he added that housewives could look for little if any effect on prices they pay for meat this year at least.

The other news item is from the New York Times of Sunday, July 9, 1961, entitled "Drought Worse in North Plains."

The article is as follows:

DROUGHT WORSE IN NORTH PLAINS—DISASTER ZONE IS WIDENED—CANADIAN AREA HIT

(By Donald Janson)

CHICAGO, July 8.—A searing drought in the northern plains spread and worsened this week.

Scattered rains and a slight drop in temperature were insufficient to break the hold of the area's worst dry spell in a quarter of a century.

Sections of eastern Wyoming and northern Wisconsin were added to the officially desig-

nated disaster zone, which includes all of North Dakota and much of Montana, Minnesota and South Dakota.

Drastically reduced wheat production was forecast. In some localities, a moving blanket of grasshoppers destroyed grain not killed by the drought.

Cattle were being marketed early because of lack of pasture and water. Many stock ponds and creeks were dry and fields were parched and brown west of Minnesota after a month of temperatures ranging from the high eighties to more than 100. In some places there was no rain at all during a June that was the hottest and driest of the century.

MANY CROPS DEAD

"Rain wouldn't do much good now," said a Montanan. "Most unirrigated crops are already dead."

A Washburn, N. Dak., farmer said grasshoppers had eaten some of his cornstalks right down to the ground. The migratory insects have moved as far east as Minnesota.

But despite the ravages of the drought, nobody rated it with the prolonged dust bowl of the 1930's.

The entire great plains was affected by the acute drought of the midthirties. Moistureless topsoil, caught by hot winds, was swept over the prairies in dark clouds. Crop failures were commonplace. Cattle starved.

Subsoil moisture has not reached such critical lows in most sections this year, although a limited snow cover got the northern tier of States off to a poor start.

Soil-conserving practices, adopted by more and more farmers since the thirties, provide insurance against a repetition of the disastrous blowing of 25 years ago.

CATTLE SOLD AT A LOSS

Nor are cattle starving today. But some ranchers are being forced to sell them at a loss to feeders outside the stricken area.

Some North Dakota farmers were plowing their wilted wheat under this week in order to seed fast-growing grasses for forage.

Others turned cattle loose to graze in wheat fields.

The National Farmers Union shipped in baled hay and set up hay banks for sale of the feed to farmers.

One hundred and thirty-four counties have been designated a disaster area by the Department of Agriculture. They were thus made eligible for various types of Federal aid.

In addition, the Department of Agriculture is helping State agencies and ranchers to control grasshopper infestations with chemicals.

The insect scourge is worst in eastern Montana and Wyoming and the western Dakotas. One Montanan said it was heavier in his State than the grasshopper plague that accompanied the drought of the thirties. He said soil-bank land, in some cases overgrown with weeds, was a principal breeding ground.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that 100 percent of the money authorized to be appropriated in the pending bill is to be repaid by the hunters who, of course, are the ones who will benefit the most. I will say in all candor to the House, the public is asked to help out on this project by foregoing the interest on the money advanced over a period of time. This has been the practice in reclamation projects over many years and has worked well. I should also say that provisions in the initial drafts of the bill for backdoor spending have been eliminated so the money is subject now, as the bill is drawn, to the appropriation process.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have estimated that approximately two out of

every three households in my district contain a male member of the family who is a duck hunter or a goose hunter and who is vitally interested in the passage and enactment of this bill.

I have a telegram from the Acting Director of the Kansas Forestry Fish and Game Commission, Mr. Fred Warders, stating, and I quote from the message:

Early passage of this bill is of tremendous importance to sportsmen and conservationists of Kansas and to all States in their combined efforts to preserve and perpetuate our Nation's wetland wildlife species and their habitat.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

[Mr. GOODLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who sponsored this legislation, and the other Members who cosponsored similar legislation that I would be remiss in my duty as a sportsman from my State of West Virginia if I did not participate in debate and request that the House give approval to this type of legislation.

We have no extensive lands in West Virginia of this kind, but I think every outstanding sportsmen's organization in my State, and most of them over the Nation, have written to me because of the fact that all the years I have been in the Congress of the United States I have been an ardent conservationist and voted for all types of conservation legislation.

It would be a sorry mistake if the House failed to approve this legislation or failed to take advantage of the opportunity to acquire these lands and hold them for the future. The situation could easily arise where it might cost double what it would cost today to acquire them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge that the legislation be given approval.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not rise in opposition to this bill. I have no quarrel with the very commendable need for preserving wildlife habitat in this Nation as our population grows and the natural habitat of all upland game and waterfowl tends to decrease.

North Dakota is right in the middle of the great north-south flyway of migratory waterfowl. We have tens and even hundreds of thousands of acres of land in North Dakota called wildlife habitat and wildlife resting ground, as the ducks and geese fly north and south in the spring and the fall. I think it is important that we preserve this refuge, this habitat, this place where migratory

waterfowl can nest, can stop, can rest, can feed.

However, as we acquire, in the name of the Federal Government, more and more of this land, we must keep in mind what is happening to our local political subdivisions. I believe there is a provision of some kind in the present Wildlife Land Acquisition Act which provides that the local subdivisions shall receive in lieu of taxes some portion—I do not know whether it is 25 or 50 percent—of the revenue that the Government receives for the land that is taken out of private ownership and brought into Federal ownership. The simple fact of the matter is that the Government receives practically no remuneration from these lands, as a consequence of which the political subdivisions, the local school districts, and so forth, receive no revenue in lieu of the taxes they previously received.

I think this is eminently important, I think it is vital for the existence of the school districts remaining in these areas, that some provision be made in this type of legislation to reimburse the local political subdivisions, the school districts, the counties, and the townships for the loss of taxable valuation which results in a loss of tax revenue for schools and roads that must be provided for people living in the area. This has happened time and time again in North Dakota, and it has had an extremely adverse effect on many of our local political subdivisions.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on the subject. I think it is a very commendable objective in the first place, to preserve wildlife habitat but I do think there are practical aspects that should be kept in mind. I hope some provision better than the one that exists now may be retained to provide some revenue for the political subdivisions where this land acquisition takes place.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, as has already been stated, this is simply a speedup program for the acquisition of wet lands for the conservation of migratory waterfowl. It will not cost the Federal Government an additional dollar. All of the money in the final analysis will come out of the duck stamp funds. The bill provides for an advance of \$150 million from the Government over a 10-year period to be used for the acquisition of wet lands, as they are called. After the acquisition of these lands, 75 percent of the proceeds of the sale of duck stamps will be paid to the Government for such period of time until the \$150 million is repaid without interest. It is estimated that the duck stamp proceeds will amount to about \$4 million to \$6 million annually.

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for his sponsorship of this bill. It is a fine piece of legislation, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support H.R. 7391, because the task of saving America's wet lands has become a national imperative. Unless these wet lands can be saved before they are drained, or priced out of the market, our treasured flights of migratory ducks and geese will be no more. Not merely the sportsmen, but all of outdoor America will have lost an incalculable resource.

Back in 1934, the Fish and Wildlife Service established a goal of 7,500,000 acres of wet lands in Federal ownership. Today, the Fish and Wildlife Service has acquired barely 3,500,000 acres, leaving 4 million acres to go.

In 1958 the Congress enacted into law an amendment to the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act raising the price of the duck stamp to \$3, and providing that starting July 1, 1960, all receipts from the sale of these stamps, less the cost of printing and distribution, should be used to acquire wet lands for waterfowl use. The requirement of 100-percent dedication to land acquisition was a great step forward, since previously 85 percent of the receipts had been diverted to other purposes.

Fine as the 1958 amendment was, it had hardly gone into effect before its inadequacies became apparent. As Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife Director D. F. Janzen has pointed out, because of ever-increasing land costs, waterfowl hunting has grown poorer. Fewer hunters have taken the field. As a result, duck stamp sales have lagged, and with them the wherewithal to acquire new refuges. This in turn has caused poorer hunting, fewer hunters, smaller duck stamp receipts, and a further lag in the acquisition program.

A special 1959-60 posthunting season sale of duck stamps was inaugurated in order to permit interested citizens to contribute to the land acquisition fund. But through mid-May 1960, only 1,153 such stamps had been sold.

If the 2 million hunters expected each year present themselves, this would make a fund of approximately \$6 million annually for acquisition. To acquire the 4 million additional acres would cost \$160 million at a rate of \$40 an acre, or \$200 million at the rate of \$50 an acre—\$40 to \$50 being a reasonable estimate of acquisition costs. If we have to wait for 30 years to acquire the land, we never will do so, and the inadequate annual duck stamp receipts will continue to decline.

What is needed, therefore, is a buy-now-pay-later program which will put the Department of the Interior in funds to acquire the necessary 4 million acres in the next 10 years, the loan to be repaid from duck stamp receipts thereafter. H.R. 7391 does just this. Repayment to the Treasury from subsequent duck stamp receipts will commence in 10 years, in fiscal 1972.

The \$150 million, plus the current duck stamps receipts, should prove ade-

quate to provide the \$160 million to \$200 million needed to acquire the necessary 4 million acres. By creating the wet lands, we shall be creating the means to repay the purchase money loan.

The conservation-minded citizens of the United States will be forever grateful to the Congress if we will realize before it is too late the desperate need for legislation such as H.R. 7391.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly commend the members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], and the great conservationist, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. DINGELL], who has done such an outstanding job on this legislation.

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill now pending.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan, the sponsor of H.R. 7391, for introducing this bill. I know that I speak for all the sportsmen and conservationists in the Northeast in urging the House to pass favorably on this bill this afternoon.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill under discussion. I have introduced similar legislation in the past and I feel this legislation is essential for the preservation of our waterfowl resources. Unless some action is taken soon, most serious losses will result.

I have received correspondence from both the acting director of the Kansas Forestry Fish and Game Commission and the president of the Kansas Association for Wildlife, urging my support of this measure. I include their letters below:

JULY 7, 1961.

DEAR SIR: The sportsman clubs of Kansas, affiliated with Kansas Association for Wildlife, heartily endorse H.R. 7391.

We believe that the action sponsored by this bill is urgently needed for the survival of our migratory waterfowl.

The bill is scheduled for consideration Monday morning, July 10. We would appreciate your favorable action on this bill.

Sincerely,

ROGER C. ARENSDORF,
President, Kansas Association for Wildlife.

[Telegram]

JULY 6, 1961.

Your attention is invited to the upcoming vote on the emergency wetlands acquisition bill H.R. 7391 on Monday, July 10. Early passage of this bill is of tremendous importance to sportsmen and conservationists of Kansas and to all States in their combined efforts to preserve and perpetuate our Nation's wetland wildlife species and their

habitat. We respectfully urge your support of H.R. 7391.

FRED WARDERS,
Acting Director, Kansas Forestry Fish
and Game Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7391.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

APPORTIONMENT TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS OF ITS SHARE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 472.

The Clerk read the title of the House Joint Resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been cleared on this side of the aisle?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution in which time is of the essence. In the last session of the Massachusetts Legislature a law was passed increasing the tonnage of trucks on the interstate highways from 60,000 to 73,000 pounds. The Bureau of Public Roads informed the State officials that this would conform with the Federal law. Upon looking it over further, they realized that the advance opinion was not the correct one, but in the meantime the legislature had passed a law and the Governor had signed it. There was sort of a faulty line of communication. Nobody is subject to criticism on this matter. The legislature had adjourned.

The apportionment for the fiscal year 1963 will be made in the early part of August, and it is a question whether to call the Massachusetts Legislature back into special session for this particular purpose or to allow the Massachusetts apportionment for the fiscal year 1963, which will be about \$51 million, to be made and to be sort of held in abeyance until on or before March 15 of next year, to give the Massachusetts Legislature, which meets in January, an opportunity to amend or repeal or correct the State law, which was innocently enacted into law, to conform with the Federal law. That is the whole purpose of this resolution.

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if there was any faulty line of communication with the minority leadership on this side.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have cleared it with all parties.

Mr. PELLY. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

87TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7391

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 11, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce

AN ACT

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to promote the conservation of migratory
4 waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of im-
5 portant wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to
6 the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized
7 to be appropriated for the ten-year period beginning with
8 fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$150,000,000.

9 SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to
10 this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for pur-

1 poses of the migratory bird conservation fund established
2 pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp
3 Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 451; 16
4 U.S.C. 718d).

5 SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be
6 treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory
7 bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning
8 with fiscal year 1972, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of
9 the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment
10 shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum
11 of the moneys accruing annually to such fund: *Provided*,
12 That in the event the full amount authorized by section 1 of
13 this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid ten-
14 year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this
15 section shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1961.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

REPORT
OF THE
COMMISSIONER OF THE
LAND OFFICE
TO THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO
FOR THE YEAR
1901

W. W. L.

PRINTED BY
H. W. L.

AN ACT

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

JULY 11, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Commerce

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

CONTENTS

Issued August 9, 1961
For actions of August 8, 1961
87th-1st, No. 135

Appropriations.....	1,31,45
Assistant Secretaries.....	6
Atomic energy.....	2
Automation.....	28
Broomcorn.....	7
Centennials.....	8
Civil defense.....	19
Conservation.....	20
Depressed areas.....	25
Economics.....	33
Electric energy.....	2
Electrification.....	18,22
Farm housing.....	1
Farm program.....	2,16,23
Feed grains.....	16
Food research.....	19
Foreign aid.....	9,27,32,44
Foreign trade.....	14
Hog cholera.....	3
Lands.....	4,10
Life insurance.....	29
Loans.....	1
Manpower.....	42

Marketing.....	26
Mineral subsidies.....	15
Monopolies.....	43
National parks.....	30
Patents.....	5,35
Peace Corps.....	40
Personnel.....	29,36
Poultry disease.....	24
Purchasing.....	34
Reclamation.....	13,22,38
Retirement.....	36
Salaries and expenses.....	1
Small business.....	37,41
Soil conservation.....	1
Soviet agriculture.....	21
Tomatoes.....	37
Trademarks.....	26
Transportation.....	11
Water conservation.....	1
Water resources.....	17,38
Waterfowl.....	12
Weights and measures.....	39
Wetlands.....	12
Youth corps.....	20

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill for hog cholera eradication. Senate committee reported bills for USDA and land-grant college centennial celebrations. Sens. Keating, Proxmire and Tower debated farm policy. Senate debated foreign aid bill.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimate for fiscal year 1962 (H. Doc. 217); to Appropriations Committee. The document includes the following items for the Farmers Home Administration of this Department: (1) Farm Housing Grants and Loans as authorized by P. L. 87-70 which amends the Housing Act of 1949, \$10,000,000; (2) additional amount for Salaries and Expenses, \$2,400,000, including \$250,000 for farm housing research and study programs to be conducted by the Agricultural Research Service and the Economic Research Service; and (3) a language proposal making the \$37.5 million contingency authorization for farm operating loans provided in the 1962 Agricultural Appropriation Act available also for Soil and Water Conservation Loans p. 13945

The "Daily Digest" states that "Conferees met in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate and House-passed versions of H. R. 7851, fiscal 1962 appropriations for the Defense Establishment, but did not reach final agreement." p. D679

2. ATOMIC ENERGY. By a vote of 235 to 164, agreed to send H. R. 7576, the AEC authorization bill, to conference with the House conferees instructed not to agree to the \$95 million for the electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash., as contained in the Senate amendment. Rejected earlier, 164 to 235, a motion to table the motion to instruct the conferees. House conferees were appointed. pp. 13896-908.

2. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Albert commended the President for signing the Agricultural Act of 1961 and said, "This act is an important milestone in the history of agricultural legislation in this country." p. 13889
3. HOG CHOLERA. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7176, to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program (H. Rept. 864). p. 13945
4. PUBLIC LANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 702, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a tract of forest land in Wyoming to the town of Afton (H. Rept. 866). p. 13945
5. PATENTS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 499, authorizing a celebration of the American patent system (H. Rept. 871). p. 13945
6. ASSISTANT SECRETARIES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6360, to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. p. D678
7. BROOMCORN. Several Representatives discussed the plight of the broomcorn industry. pp. 13926-7

SENATE

8. CENTENNIALS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 435, to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture (S. Rept. 680), and H. J. Res. 436, to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the national system of land-grant universities and colleges (S. Rept. 681). p. 13949
9. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on S. 1983, the foreign aid authorization bill. pp. 13956-8, 13958-9, 13974-9, 13980-98, 14004-9, 14014-7, 14035-6
10. PUBLIC LANDS. Passed without amendment H. R. 2925, to amend the act of March 8, 1922, so as to permit the sale of certain isolated tracts of public lands in Alaska. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14021
11. TRANSPORTATION. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1368, with amendment, to continue the authority for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders, and S. 1978, with amendment, to provide for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933. p. D676
12. WATERFOWL; WETLANDS. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment, H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by authorizing Federal acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. p. D676
13. RECLAMATION. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee S. 970, to authorize construction of the Mid-State reclamation project, Nebr., and S. 230, to modify provisions relating to the construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit, Missouri River Basin project. p. D676
14. FOREIGN TRADE. The Commerce Committee ^{voted to} report with amendment S. 1729, the proposed Foreign Commerce Act of 1961 to improve and expand services necessary for the export of U. S. products. p. D676

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited).

CONTENTS

Issued August 11, 1961
For actions of August 10, 1961
87th-1st, No. 137

Adjournment.....	25		
Appropriations.....	6,12		
Assistant Secretaries...	16		
Bonding.....	11		
Budget.....	6		
Civil defense.....	12		
Cooperatives.....	30		
Development loans.....	3		
Easements.....	20		
Educational exchange....	10		
Electrification.....	30	Legislative	
Expenditures.....	33	accomplishments.....	8
Farm program.....	5,28,34	Legislative program.....	24
Food.....	15,26	Life insurance.....	32
Foreign aid.....	4,19,27	Manpower.....	18
Foreign trade.....	31	Mining.....	13
Inflation.....	6	Natural resources.....	29
International		Peace Corps.....	1
organizations.....	9	Personnel.....	22,32,33
Lands.....	7,17,20	Power.....	23
		Prices.....	6
		Property.....	35,36
		Purchasing.....	36
		Reimbursements.....	21
		Sugar.....	14
		Training.....	22
		Urban affairs.....	29
		Veterans' benefits.....	3
		Waterfowl.....	2
		Wetlands.....	2

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared foreign aid authorization bill. Senate debated foreign aid authorization bill. Sen. Humphrey praised Administration farm program. Both Houses agreed to conference report on defense appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill to establish Peace Corps.

SENATE

- 1. PEACE CORPS.** The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendment S. 2000, to provide for the establishment of a Peace Corps to assist underdeveloped nations and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower (S. Rept. 706). p. 14334
- 2. WATERFOWL; WETLANDS.** The Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by authorizing Federal acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat (S. Rept. 705). p. 14334
- 3. VETERANS' BENEFITS.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendment S. 349, to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces between Jan. 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963 (S. Rept. 700). p. 14334
- 4. FOREIGN AID.** Continued debate on S. 1983, the foreign aid authorization bill (pp. 14344, 14373-85, 14400-01, 14428-31). Agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Sen. Mansfield that beginning Fri., Aug. 11, debate on the amendment

by Sen. Byrd, Va., to provide that development loans to foreign countries shall be financed by appropriations authorized annually rather than by long-term borrowing authority as provided in the bill, shall be limited to 7 hours (p. 14401). Sen. Mansfield announced that the Senate would remain in session Fri. until there is a vote on the Byrd amendment (p. 14415).

5. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey praised enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1961 as "the most important agricultural legislation since the passage of the basic Agricultural Act of 1938," commended Secretary Freeman, Sen. Ellender, and Rep. Cooley and their associates for their efforts in obtaining enactment of this legislation, and inserted the statements of the President and Secretary Freeman at the time of the President's approval of the bill. Also, he inserted summaries prepared by this Department of the Agricultural Act of 1961 and of the achievements and the progress of this administration in the field of agriculture in the past 6 months. pp. 14422-8
6. INFLATION. Sen. Keating called for a six-point program to fight inflation, including a government sponsored campaign to encourage merchants to expand their sales by lowering prices, establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget, authority for the President to veto individual items in appropriation bills, and a special session of Congress of about 1 month each year "to focus on appropriations and related economic decisions." pp. 14349-50
7. PUBLIC LANDS. Sen. Morse inserted a newspaper editorial "lauding the recent announcement by the Secretary of Interior that recreation areas may now be purchased from the national land reserve for \$2.50 an acre or lease them for 25 cents an acre per year." p. 14398
8. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a summary of major legislative actions taken by the first session of the 87th Congress, including legislation relating to the omnibus farm bill, housing, area redevelopment, feed grains, drought relief, farm loans, sugar, etc. pp. 14417-9
9. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. Both Houses received from the State Department a report on U. S. contributions to international organizations for fiscal year 1960. pp. 14331, 14334
10. EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE. Received from the State Department a report on the educational exchange program for the calendar year 1960. p. 14334
11. BONDING. Received from GSA a proposed bill "to amend the act of April 29, 1941, as amended, to authorize any Federal agency to waive performance and payment bonds"; to Government Operations Committee. p. 14334

HOUSE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7851, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1962, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President (pp. 14262-78, 14393-6). The bill includes \$207,600,000 for civil defense activities.
13. MINING. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was granted until midnight Sat. to file a report on H. R. 84, to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands. p. 14261
Rep. Knox discussed his bill H. R. 8474, to restore certain past administrative practices in computing gross income from mining for percentage depletion purposes. pp. 14322-4

ACQUISITION OF WET LANDS AND OTHER
WATERFOWL HABITAT

AUGUST 10, 1961.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 7391]

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 7391 as amended by your committee would authorize to be appropriated for a 5-year period, beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$50 million for the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat. Funds appropriated pursuant to this proposed bill shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1967, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 90 per centum of the moneys accruing annually to such funds.

THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND

The only source of revenue for this fund comes from the sale of migratory bird hunting stamps, the so-called duck stamp. Total receipts for fiscal year 1960, the first year of the \$3 duck stamps, amounted to \$4,836,111. It is estimated that receipts in future years will average between \$5 and \$6 million a year. This fund, less Post Office Department expenses for printing and distributing the stamps, are used for the location, ascertainment, and acquisition of migratory

bird refuges and waterfowl production areas. That is the only purpose for which the fund can be used.

WETLANDS

The Nation, to be successful in its objective of preserving sufficient habitat to sustain our migratory waterfowl must step up its wetlands acquisition program. With only present duck stamp revenues available, we cannot hope to achieve our goal of acquiring the additional lands in less than 40 years.

We need to have not less than 12½ million acres of wetlands under public control in the 48 contiguous States. These lands must be properly distributed throughout nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. At this time a total of 5½ million acres is already in public ownership, 3½ million acres under control of the Fish and Wildlife Service and 2 million acres controlled by the States. The four flyway councils have determined which areas should be given priority attention and which new projects should be acquired and whether with State or Federal funds. Under this agreement, subject to annual revision, it is planned that of the 7 million acres to be acquired, the Federal Government will acquire 4½ million acres and the States the remaining 2½ million acres.

The Fish and Wildlife Service advised your committee that of the 127 million acres of wetlands once available, over 80 percent have been either destroyed completely or their wildlife value seriously reduced by man's activities. Each year since 1949 over 1 million non-farm dwelling units have been built in suburban areas. Many real estate developments involve the filling in of coastal marshes and estuaries. New industries are located on reclaimed land along our rivers. Marshes and swamps are being annihilated in the construction of highways and airports. Millions of acres of wetlands have been drained to provide additional agricultural land. In the northern prairie States about one-half of the important waterfowl production habitat has been destroyed through drainage.

Of those 127 million acres of wetlands in the United States, now less than 23 million acres are of significant value for migratory waterfowl.

Your committee held public hearings on H.R. 7391 and a companion Senate measure (S. 2175) introduced by Senator Humphrey. The legislation was vigorously supported by all witnesses; no one appeared in opposition.

This bill, according to its proponents would provide funds for wetlands purchases while that land is still available and enable the acquisition to be made during a period when the cost is estimated to be less than in later years.

The preservation of these wetlands will provide a substantial contribution to the national water conservation program. They will also preserve and create a much needed recreational potential, the need for which will continue as our population increases. Then, too, these wetlands are essential to many forms of wildlife and will provide habitat for many birds and animals.

Your committee is of the opinion that a large share of this appropriation will be used to purchase lands in areas where recreational opportunities are becoming more and more important to our citizens.

COSTS

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$50 million over a 5-year period. This sum with the anticipated revenue of \$25 million from the sale of duck stamps over the same period would make available \$75 million. After 5 years the bill would provide that 90 percent of the duck stamp funds would be returned to the Treasury until the \$50 million loan is repaid and the lands would then be held for migratory waterfowl refuges debt free.

The bill would provide that funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be treated as an advance, without interest to the migratory game fund. Your committee is of the opinion that the public benefits from this program justify placing the interest burden on the public. The entire cost of the program is to be paid by the duck hunters from their \$3 duck stamp, but all of the lands purchased with this money would be owned by the United States.

THE AMENDMENTS

On line 7, page 1, strike "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period".

On line 8, page 1, strike "\$150,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 2, line 8, strike "1972" and insert "1967".

On page 2, line 10, strike "75 per centum" and insert "90 per centum".

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period".

On page 2, at the end of line 15, change the period to a colon and add the following:

Provided further, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency.

AGENCY REPORTS

Reports from the Department of the Interior and the Treasury Department on similar legislation, submitted to the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1961.

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BONNER: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 4603, a bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes. This report is applicable also to the identical bills, H.R. 4624 and H.R. 6133.

We urge that this proposed legislation be revised and enacted in accordance with the attached redraft thereof. Such draft incorporates certain changes that are self-explanatory and which we feel are desirable in carrying out the object of this proposal.

This proposal will authorize a significant and highly desirable program of land acquisition for the benefit of the Nation's migratory waterfowl. We believe that it will provide a practicable means of stepping up such land acquisition activities, with the ultimate costs thereof being financed with duck stamp revenues. This is generally consistent with the policy already established by the Congress for the use of such revenues.

Such a program is desirable, we believe, due to the fact that various factors—our rapidly increasing human population, continuing urban and industrial expansion, as well as various agricultural and other land drainage programs and activities—are having a very adverse effect upon our migratory waterfowl, i.e., principally ducks and geese. Marshes and swamps have been ditched, dredged, drained, burned, filled, paved, and polluted to meet the demands of modern civilization for more agricultural lands, more industrial sites, more urban housing developments, more roads, and more airports, etc.

It is significant to note that there were originally in the 48 contiguous States some 127 million acres of wetlands; however, by 1955 this total acreage was reduced to approximately 74 million acres. Of this amount only 22.5 million are now of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. Each year this acreage shrinks considerably. Time is running out in the race to preserve our migratory waterfowl. These factors are reducing the natural habitat available to our migratory waterfowl and are creating an urgent need for well-considered counter-measures. The only solution, we believe, is an expansion in the Federal land acquisition program for the benefit of our migratory waterfowl resource. Unless appropriate action is taken soon, very serious losses to this resource will result.

Although considerable areas of wetlands and other suitable waterfowl habitat are still available in certain places, opportunities for acquisition thereof are disappearing rapidly. Pressures for other use and development of these areas are increasing. Land costs have continued to rise. In carrying forward our refuge acquisition program, we are handicapped frequently by a lack of sufficient funds with which to acquire, when they become available, many of the excellent properties that are needed for these purposes.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, it should be noted that an important step has been made toward accomplishment of the goal that we are convinced is desirable in providing adequately for our migratory waterfowl population. The Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, as amended by the act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 486; 16 U.S.C. 718d), requires that beginning on July 1, 1960, all net revenues from duck stamp sales be used for the purchase or lease of lands for these purposes. We expect future revenues from this source to range from \$5 to \$6 million each year; however, because of the adverse factors previously indicated, we must emphasize that these duck stamp revenues will be grossly inadequate. They will permit only very gradual acquisition of the needed properties. Consequently, an accelerated land acquisition program is urgently needed in order that we may obtain, while they are still available, those important wetlands and other wildlife habitat areas that are essential for our migratory waterfowl.

This proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed \$20 million a year over a 10-year period; however, it should be noted that under the terms of this bill, these funds would be paid back out of duck stamp revenues, beginning in 1972. Our proposed revision would eliminate the annual limitation which we believe is unnecessary. Appropriations made during the 10-year period, when merged with the duck stamp revenues may be expected to provide a total of some \$200 million during the 10-year period. In order to carry out this program in the manner and scale that we believe it should be carried out, we estimated that \$10 million could be obligated for land acquisition in fiscal year 1962; \$12 million in 1963; \$19 million in 1964; \$23 million in 1965; \$25 million in 1966-67; \$23 million in 1968, and \$21 million in 1969-71. We anticipate that such expenditures would be sufficient to acquire title or lease approximately 3,960,000 acres of waterfowl lands. We would expect to acquire title to approximately 2,810,000 acres and to lease or acquire easements to approximately 1,150,000 acres. This amount of acquisition and control of land for waterfowl conservation purposes would comprise 88 percent of the total of 4.5 million acres that we consider to be a desirable ultimate goal for such acquisition by the Federal Government. At the end of the 10-year period we would expect to continue land acquisition with 25 percent of the duck stamp revenues, as indicated under the terms of our suggested revision, until the remaining acreage is obtained. The remaining portion of the duck stamp revenues, 75 percent under the terms of our redraft, would be used for repayment of the funds advanced for land acquisition.

The need for Federal and State cooperation and progressive action in perpetuating the Nation's waterfowl resources has become generally recognized. Public ownership or control of 12.5 million acres of key wetlands in the 48 contiguous States is highly desirable. It is essential that these lands be properly distributed throughout the nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. This Department now manages some 3.5 million acres for this purpose and the States manage some 2 million acres of suitable waterfowl land. Under the Federal-State program that we envision, the Federal Government would acquire the additional lands to which we have referred previously in the amount of 4.5 million acres, and the States would acquire the remaining additional 2.5 million acres, thereby bringing the total acreage under public management for waterfowl resource conservation up to 12.5 million acres.

So far as Federal expenditures are concerned, the income from the \$3 duck stamp, which is earmarked for this land acquisition program, will repay the cost of the Federal portion of such program, as indicated by the terms of this proposed legislation. In this connection, you will note that our suggested revision contains a provision that will permit an increase in the cost of the duck stamp to \$4 after the first \$50 million has been advanced, unless the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of pertinent factors, determines that such an increase is unwarranted and contrary to the public interest. A similar \$1 increase in the price of the duck stamp would be made after the advancement of the second \$50 million unless the Secretary finds that such an increase is not in the public interest.

We anticipate full cooperation by the States in carrying forward this program. We believe this proposal is in the public interest be-

cause it will permit Federal acquisition of these important waterfowl lands while they are still available and at less cost than would be the case if such acquisition is carried out over a long period of time.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 22, 1961.

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 4603 to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes.

The only provision of the bill of primary interest to this Department is section 3, which would authorize the Secretary of Interior to issue noninterest-bearing notes in an amount not to exceed \$150 million for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in order to obtain funds for the migratory bird conservation fund.

The Department would be opposed to the foregoing provision. The Department generally looks with disfavor upon providing funds for Federal programs through the device of so-called back-door financing rather than by the regular appropriation process. When that device is used, it is usually limited to revenue-producing programs, such as Federal direct loan programs where the loans made from the proceeds of Treasury borrowing are repayable with interest. The funds that would be obtained pursuant to section 3 of the bill would be used for a nonrevenue purpose, i.e., the acquisition of land, and the Department is of the opinion that the necessary funds in such a case should be obtained by direct appropriations.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

R. H. KNIGHT, *General Counsel.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

There are no changes in existing law.



Calendar No. 681

87TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7391

[Report No. 705]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 11, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce

AUGUST 10, 1961

Reported by Mr. MAGNUSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to promote the conservation of migratory
4 waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of im-
5 portant wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to
6 the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized
7 to be appropriated for the ~~ten-year period~~ *five-year period*
8 beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed ~~\$150,000,000~~
9 *\$50,000,000.*

10 SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to

1 this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for pur-
2 poses of the migratory bird conservation fund established
3 pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp
4 Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 451; 16
5 U.S.C. 718d).

6 SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be
7 treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory
8 bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning
9 with fiscal year ~~1972~~ 1967, shall be repaid to the Treasury
10 out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such re-
11 payment shall be made in annual amounts comprising ~~75~~
12 ~~per centum~~ 90 per centum of the moneys accruing annually
13 to such fund: *Provided*, That in the event the full amount
14 authorized by section 1 of this Act is appropriated prior to
15 the end of the aforesaid ~~ten-year period~~, *five-year period*,
16 the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall
17 begin with the next full fiscal ~~year~~. *year*: *Provided further*,
18 *That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migra-*
19 *tory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has*
20 *been approved by the appropriate State or State agency.*

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1961.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

87TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 7391

[Report No. 705]

AN ACT

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

JULY 11, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Commerce

AUGUST 10, 1961

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only
should not be quoted
or cited)

CONTENTS

Issued August 29, 1961
For actions of August 28, 1961
87th-1st, No. 149

Appropriations.....7		
Area redevelopment.....7		
Boundary compact.....36		
Centennials.....35		
Easements.....4		
Economics.....21		
Electrification...14,18,33		
Exhibits.....21		
Farm program.....24		
Foreign affairs.....23		
Foreign aid.....12		
Foreign trade.....34		
Forestry.....8		
Hog cholera.....1		
Housing.....3		
Labeling.....28		
Lands.....4,31		
Marketing.....32		
Mining.....29		
Motor vehicles.....11		
National parks.....22		
Peace corps.....16		
Personnel.....11,23		
Poultry prices.....13		
Reclamation.....33		
Saline water.....9,20		
Shorelines.....8		
Small business..5,10,26,30		
Sugar.....25		
Surplus property.....27		
Tobacco.....2		
Transportation.....15		
Waterfowl.....6		
Wetlands.....6		
Wheat.....19		
Wilderness.....17		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed hog cholera eradication bill. House concurred in Senate amendments to bill to permit transfer of tobacco allotments. Both Houses passed appropriation continuation measure. House committee reported bill to establish Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

HOUSE

- HOG CHOLERA.** Passed without amendment S. 1908, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a national hog cholera eradication program, restrict the interstate movement of virulent or other hog cholera virus as necessary, and establish a committee to advise on the program. This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H. R. 7176, was passed earlier and tabled. pp. 16143-54
- TOBACCO.** Agreed to the Senate amendments on H. R. 1022, to authorize leasing of tobacco acreage allotments for the crop years 1962 and 1963. This bill will now be sent to the President. As passed, the bill will be inapplicable with respect to burley tobacco, and in the case of Maryland (type 32), leasing will be limited to those farms which have planted at least 75% of their Maryland allotments in each of the years 1960 and 1961. The leasing of allotments will be permitted only between farms in the same county, and not more than 5 acres will be permitted to be leased and transferred to any farm. p. 16154

3. HOUSING. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8429, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing (H. Rept. 1053). p. 16188
4. EASEMENTS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8355, to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies (H. Rept. 1044). p. 16188
5. SMALL BUSINESS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8870, the proposed Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1961 (H. Rept. 1040). p. 16188

SENATE

6. WET LANDS; WATERFOWL. Passed, 65 to 8, H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by authorizing appropriations for a 5-year period, beginning with fiscal year 1962, of not to exceed \$50 million for the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat (pp. 16066, 16068-70, 16073-4, 16076-82). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Case, S. Dak., to prohibit the use of the migratory bird conservation fund for the acquisition of land without the approval in certain instances of the Governor of the State in which the land is located (pp. 16069-70).
7. TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 544, the appropriations continuation resolution to make temporary appropriations until Sept. 30, 1961, to those departments and agencies whose annual appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. This measure will now be sent to the President. The measure increases the amount for administrative expenses of area redevelopment programs from \$400,000 to \$600,000. pp. 16059-60, 16128-31
8. FORESTRY; SHORELINE AREAS. Passed with amendments S. 543, to promote the preservation of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the U. S., including a provision directing the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of shoreline areas in the 181 million acres of national forests which are of value for recreational, cultural, physical and scientific purposes and to report his findings to Congress within 2 years (pp. 16082-92). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. McNamara to delete Pictured Rocks and Grand Sable Dunes and Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich., from the areas in which the Secretary of the Interior is directed to make a study to determine what further action should be taken to preserve the areas (p. 16087).
Sen. Moss expressed opposition to a proposed amendment by Sen. Bennett to S. 174, the wilderness preservation bill, which is "intended to put the High Uintas Primitive Area into the wilderness preservation system without further review by the National Forest Service," and inserted a letter he received from the Forest Service stating that the High Uintas Primitive Area "in due course will be proposed for reclassification by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wilderness area under the procedures prescribed by Secretarial regulation." p. 16039
9. SALINE WATER. S. 2156, to expand and extend the saline water conversion program, was made the unfinished business of the Senate. pp. 16092-4
10. SMALL BUSINESS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 836, the proposed Small Business Act Amendments of 1961 (S. Rept. 802). p. 16036

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate, as I know the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE] also does, the high praise which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has given us. It is praise indeed when it comes from a man who has had a practical working knowledge of the vast field of aviation for many years during the regrettable, although, I am happy to say, brief interval between his membership in the House and his membership in the Senate. His interest in aviation in the House has continued to be one of his prime interests in this body, and his worthwhile suggestions and willing cooperation have always been most valuable.

The bill does not satisfy me 100 percent. Neither does it completely satisfy the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], or the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE]. However, as to all such matters which deal with business rights and franchises under very delicate circumstances, there had to be a "giving" on all sides. No one got all he wanted in the bill. Still, as I view the bill, for the first time since I began my membership in this body—and that goes back 11 years—it offers hope for peace among all the branches of our great air transportation system; hope that there will be a live and let-live policy, by which there will be an opportunity for small business to serve as supplemental carriers. "Supplemental" means to give the necessary added service at the times and places, on the routes, and at the rates which will supplement our basic scheduled carrier service.

I believe that in all respects the bill will prove to be one which goes down the middle of the road, and that experience will demonstrate that neither the subcommittee nor the full committee has favored one branch as against the others. We have tried to provide for a type of service which will grow and which will be supplemental to that provided by other carriers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his courtesy in allowing me to make this comment. I am grateful also to the Senator from Oklahoma for his statement.

Mr. ENGLE. It was a pleasure for me to yield to the Senator from West Virginia; and I concur in the high compliment he has paid to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 8, it is proposed to insert immediately preceding the word "under", the following: "or the type of service provided therein."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, this is a clarifying amendment to make it plain that the certificate of a "cargo carrier"

does not exclude such carriers from passenger charter service. I have discussed the amendment with the junior Senator from Oklahoma. He has agreed to accept the amendment as a clarifying amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ENGLE

I propose an amendment to S. 1969, to provide that on page 12, line 8, immediately preceding the word "under" the following be added: "or the type of service provided therein."

This amendment was prompted in the light of the following considerations:

Section 401e of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 provides that "any air carrier may make charter trips or perform any other special service, without regard to the points named in the certificate, under regulations prescribed by the Board." The authority of all certificated carriers to engage in charter operations is derived from this provision. However, in construing this provision, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in 1953, ruled that it merely lifted the limitation with respect to points designated in the certificate and did not affect the type of service to be rendered. Consequently, cargo carriers would be precluded from engaging in passenger charter operations.

S. 1969 provides a statutory definition of charter. One of the primary reasons for providing a statutory definition was to discourage the Board's broad use of its exemption authority under section 416. In this connection the committee, in its report, stated on page 13:

"The committee is also strongly of the opinion that the Board's practice of routinely permitting continual large-scale charter operations by exemption is not only unwise, but illegal, because not within the 'unusual circumstances' contemplated by section 416."

I believe the committee's position in this matter is a wise and constructive one.

The cargo carriers presently carry passengers for MATS as well as passengers in transoceanic charter group by virtue of the exemption authority. Consequently in the light of the court of appeals' decision, coupled with the statutory definition of charter together with the committee's report language, there is serious question as to whether or not the cargo carriers could continue to engage in passenger charter operations. This, certainly was not the intent of the committee. In fact, it was the committee's position that the language in section 401e included all certificated air carriers and there was no intent to exclude cargo carriers. The committee, however, was not aware of the court of appeals decision, which put a different construction on this provision.

It could be argued that the cargo carriers should apply to the Board for an amendment to their certificate to permit passenger charter service. However, section 401 provides that "no term, condition, or limitation of a certificate shall restrict the right of an air carrier to add to or change schedules, equipment, accommodations, and facilities for performing the authorized transportation and service as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require." Consequently, if passenger charter rights were given the cargo carriers in their certificates, they would be placed in the unique position of being the only class of future carriers that the Board would be

without power to impose limitations as to frequency of service."

The language which I propose merely clarifies the intent of the committee to provide that the phrase "any air carrier" includes cargo carriers. It gives the Board the necessary flexibility to impose all necessary regulations as to frequency of service and otherwise in the performance of charter operations, and avoids the disadvantages inherent in giving the cargo carriers such authority in their certificates or by means of exemptions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from California and his staff have been most cooperative in helping to draft and perfect the bill. The committee has studied the amendment. In order to make doubly certain that the all-cargo carriers affected by the charter provisions of the bill do not lose that which they have always had, namely, the right to a certain amount of passenger charter, we believe the amendment will not only be of benefit to the aviation industry but will clarify the intent of Congress.

The distinguished Senator from California, as he frequently does, has come to our rescue with a needed clarification. We are happy to accept the amendment as a part of the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1969) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may move to reconsider the vote by which the bill, S. 1969, was passed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1969 was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 681, H.R. 7391.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Nebraska withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum so that the first committee amendment may be stated?

Mr. CURTIS. I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "the", it is proposed to strike out "10-year period" and insert "5-year period".

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 216 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 880, which amends section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 880) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)", and on page 1, line 6, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. They are merely technical amendments, relettering subsections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 607(b) OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT—BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6974), which amends section 607(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

I make the request for the reason that there was reported from the Committee on Commerce some time ago an identical bill, S. 1185, which is order No. 176, now on the calendar. There is no need to have the House bill in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Washington to discharge the Committee on Commerce from further consideration of H.R. 6974. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee is discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ACT OF 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 685, which amends the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 685) to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, which was, on page 4, lines 18 and 19, strike out "after June 30, 1961".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree with the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, for the purpose of the Record I desire to state that this bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce. I understand that the House amendment, which deletes the cutoff date in the bill's retirement provision, is unacceptable to the administration. In addition, I have received a letter from the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, urging that the House amendment be deleted. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
August 23, 1961.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my attention that S. 685 passed the House of Representatives on August 21, 1961, with an amendment to section 2.

Section 2 of the bill as reported to and passed by the Senate amended section 1(r) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to constitute commissioned survey officer service performed after June 30, 1961, as military service for all civil service retirement purposes. Such service performed before July 1, 1961, was still to be treated as civilian under the Retirement Act, as had consistently been the case in the past. The Retirement Act difference is that military service is credited without deposit, whereas civilian service is contributory and if current contributions have not been made there must be a deposit to secure full credit.

S. 685 was sent up by the administration and was introduced by you on that basis. The section 2 provision represented apparent administration adoption of a policy favoring the prospective transition of commissioned Survey officers from their hitherto civilian status to the category of military personnel. This move paralleled the legislation in the last Congress, Public Law 86-415, approved April 8, 1960, which had the general effect of placing Public Health Service commissioned officers in the category of military personnel for service performed from and after July 1, 1960—in other words, prospectively only.

Section 2 as amended in the House completely departs from the change advocated by the administration and would constitute commissioned Survey officer service as military (creditable free) for civil service retirement purposes, regardless of when in the past it may have been performed.

The House amendment not only departs from the principle sought by the administration, it proposes an action which I understand is wholly unprecedented. At no time in the 41-year existence of the civil service retirement system has there been legislation which would credit, as military, service which was considered civilian at the time it was performed.

For the reasons set forth above, it is my opinion that the Senate should not accept the House change in section 2 of S. 685.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAW TO CERTAIN EVENTS OCCURRING ON BOARD AIRCRAFT IN AIR COMMERCE

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2268) to amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for the application of Federal Criminal law to crimes aboard aircraft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2268) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to certain events occurring on board aircraft in air commerce which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1472) is amended by add-

ing at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"AIRCRAFT PIRACY"

"(i) (1) Whoever commits or attempts to commit aircraft piracy, as herein defined, shall be punished—

"(A) by death if the verdict of the jury shall so recommend, or, in the case of a plea of guilty, or a plea of not guilty where the defendant has waived a trial by jury, if the court in its discretion shall so order; or

"(B) by imprisonment for not less than twenty years, if the death penalty is not imposed.

"(2) As used in this subsection, the term 'aircraft piracy' means any seizure or exercise of control, by force or violence or threat of force or violence and with wrongful intent, of an aircraft in flight in air commerce.

"INTERFERENCE WITH FLIGHT CREW MEMBERS OR FLIGHT ATTENDANTS"

"(j) Whoever, while aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, assaults, intimidates, or threatens any flight crew member or flight attendant (including any steward or stewardess) of such aircraft, so as to interfere with the performance by such member or attendant of his duties or lessen the ability of such member or attendant to perform his duties, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both. Whoever in the commission of any such act uses a deadly or dangerous weapon shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

"CERTAIN CRIMES ABOARD AIRCRAFT IN FLIGHT"

"(k) (1) Whoever, while aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, commits an act which, if committed within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, as defined in section 7 of title 18, United States Code, would be in violation of section 113, 114, 661, 662, 1111, 1112, 1113, 2031, 2032, or 2111 of such title 18 shall be punished as provided therein.

"(2) Whoever, while aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, commits an act, which, if committed in the District of Columbia would be in violation of section 9 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia', approved July 29, 1892, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22-1112), shall be punished as provided therein.

"CARRYING WEAPONS ABOARD AIRCRAFT"

"(1) Except for law enforcement officers of any municipal or State government, or the Federal Government, who are authorized or required to carry arms, and except for such other persons as may be so authorized under regulations issued by the Administrator, whoever, while aboard an aircraft being operated by an air carrier in air transportation, has on or about his person a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, or whoever attempts to board such an aircraft while having on or about his person a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"FALSE INFORMATION"

"(m) (1) Whoever imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of this section, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) Whoever willfully and maliciously, or with reckless disregard for the safety of human life, imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, con-

cerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of this section, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"INVESTIGATION BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION"

"(n) Violations of subsections (i) through (m), inclusive, of this section shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 903 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1473 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"VENUE"

"SEC. 903. (a) The trial of any offense under this Act shall be in the district in which such offense is committed; or, if the offense is committed out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, the trial shall be in the district where the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought. If such offender or offenders are not so arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or if no such residence is known the indictment or information may be filed in the District of Columbia. Whenever the offense is begun in one jurisdiction and completed in another, or committed in more than one jurisdiction, it may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined, and punished in any jurisdiction in which such offense was begun, continued, or completed, in the same manner as if the offense had been actually and wholly committed therein."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (4) of section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301 (4)) is amended by striking out "operation or navigation or aircraft within" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "operation or navigation of aircraft within".

SEC. 4. Title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AUTHORITY TO REFUSE TRANSPORTATION"

"SEC. 1111. Subject to reasonable rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, any air carrier is authorized to refuse transportation to a passenger or to refuse to transport property when, in the opinion of the air carrier, such transportation would or might be inimical to safety of flight."

SEC. 5. (a) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Sec. 902. Criminal penalties." is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(i) Aircraft piracy.

"(j) Interference with flight crew members or flight attendants.

"(k) Certain crimes aboard aircraft in flight.

"(l) Carrying weapons aboard aircraft.

"(m) False information.

"(n) Investigations by Federal Bureau of Investigation."

(b) That portion of such table of contents which appears under the heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1111. Authority to refuse transportation."

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question or two for the RECORD?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This is the so-called hijacking bill which the Senate debated for a period of 2 days, some time ago. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. This is the House-passed version of the bill which the Senate had previously passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Are there major differences?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would like to explain the differences when I make my statement. Following my statement I shall move that the Senate accept the amendment of the House.

Madam President, this is the bill which was passed by the Senate on August 10, 1961, and which was passed by the House with amendments on August 23, 1961.

I have discussed the House amendments with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], and it is our considered opinion that the Senate should concur in the House amendments without a conference or further amendment.

The substance and effect of the bill as passed by the Senate and as amended by the House are practically identical. We believe, however, that the bill has been substantially improved technically by the House amendments. The House amendment adds a new subsection to the Federal Aviation Act defining and specifying the punishment for aircraft piracy, rather than making the maritime statute applicable, as did the Senate bill. The House amendment also adds a needed provision with reference to the venue for trial of these offenses. Both of these changes, in our opinion, represent an improvement in the bill as passed by the Senate.

There is one problem with reference to the section prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons aboard aircraft in that the Senate bill exempted law enforcement officers of any municipal, county, or State government from this prohibition, whereas the House bill uses the term "any municipal or State government", as did the bill as reported by the Senate committee, and makes no specific reference to county law enforcement officers. However, it is the view of the House committee, and was the view of the Senate committee, that county law enforcement officers are clearly included within the phrase "municipal or State government", so that no specific amendment to the House bill in this regard is necessary.

Madam President, it is important that the effective date of this statute not be unnecessarily postponed.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the congressional intent is to include county law enforcement officers. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. We wish to make it clear that in the acceptance of the House amendment we intend that county officers be included. The separate reference to municipal officers is necessary, because they operate under municipal ordinances; but county officers enforce State law, and therefore are an arm of the State, whether they be employed by

the county, or a parish, if the State happens to be Louisiana, or other divisions of State government.

Mr. CURTIS. The deletion of the words do not exclude county officers, but the contrary is true. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. County officers are not excluded from the exception. The only reason we are taking this matter up and urging that the House version be adopted, so we will not have to go to conference, is that we do not know when another airplane hijacking may occur. I think this is the best means for us to proceed, in order to take advantage of the work done by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] in having the bill ready so we were able to move with great rapidity.

I do not find anything substantially wrong with the version of the bill before the Senate, although it changes the provision to a minor degree, and makes the maximum punishment of imprisonment for 20 years for interfering with flight crews apply to cabin attendants. The Senate bill did not so apply.

In order not to delay passage of this vital bill, which is one of the ways we intend to discourage the commission of this heinous crime, which could cause the loss of as many as 100 lives, I think we should take the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma. I believe we were right in the first instance in not applying to stewardesses the provision which applied to flight crew members who were actually employed in duties directly involving the safety of the aircraft. But the crime having to do with interference with stewardesses may be prosecuted, either under section 1 or the other section. We assume that, if it was a minor crime, like that of a drunk quarreling with a stewardess over whether or not he could keep his bottle, he would not be charged under the major punishment portion of the bill, but under the minor provision, which would not carry the heavy penalty.

In other respects, it seems the House has not significantly changed the bill. We put the word "county" in to be sure that county law enforcement officers required to carry arms were included under the law; but I think we should make it plain, as a part of the legislative history, that county officers acting as State officers in that respect are intended to be included, although not specifically mentioned.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree, and I am sure the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who exerted great effort to expedite the bill and have it ready almost immediately, would also agree. It perhaps would help in making the legislative history if he would state that county officers, in enforcing State law, are covered under the language of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made with reference to the proposal. Senators probably know, as they should know, that the bill originally started with the proposal of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Our Aviation Subcommittee and full committee acted on the bill expeditiously, and certainly with the promptness and dispatch which should have governed our actions.

I regret that the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] is not present today. He is unavoidably detained on official business in New Hampshire.

We think the proposal is an excellent one, and it is a mark of wisdom and judgment to take the House version. We are heartily in favor of it. I commend the Senator for calling it up.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator very much for his valuable participation as well as that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] and the members of the committee on the minority side. They always cooperate for the greater safety of aviation.

Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the action by which the Senate concurred in the House amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATER FOWL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, for some years the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has been engaged in a program for the acquisition of the so-called wet lands in the United States for the purpose of preserving and conserving those lands for use by wild birds and particularly waterfowl. The program was initiated some years ago and agreed upon, so far as the nature of the lands and the places in the various States are concerned. Those places include most of the States of the Union. There was agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the States involved, whether with the Governor of the State or the regulatory

agency, such as the State game commission in my State.

We learned that the annual appropriations, from the beginning, were insufficient for a seemingly modest program. About 4 years ago we checked with the Department of the Interior on the program and learned that if the program continued at the same slow rate it would be sometime after the year 2000 when we would acquire the minimum acreage of wet lands needed. We also learned that the duck stamps, which are purchased by many Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Washington, cost \$2. The bill in this regard was originally reported by my committee on the basis that the money would be used for the acquisition of wet lands; in other words, the hunters, the Audubon Society people, the conservationists, and the wildlife people who bought stamps would pay for the acquisition of wet lands.

After we reviewed the program some 4 years ago we learned it would be something like a fantastic figure of 69 years before the minimum amount of wet lands would be acquired. Of course, in the meantime the value of lands has gone up, though not as much in the case of these particular lands as is true with regard to other lands.

We also learned that a great portion of the duck stamp money was being spent for administration.

We passed a law, with the support of all the people interested in the problem and the administration and the States involved, to increase the price of the duck stamp from \$2 to \$3, and also provided that all the money collected would be used directly for the acquisition of wet lands and that, when the lands were administered, the Department of the Interior should come to the Congress for a direct appropriation for the administration of the lands.

I think last year was the first year the \$3 charge for the duck stamp was in effect.

The \$3 charge for the duck stamp will bring in between \$4½ and \$6 million, to be put into the fund.

We learned further, in reviewing the program, that the acquisition of wet lands was not proceeding as fast as deemed desirable, even with the \$3 charge for the duck stamp.

This year there will be a great shortage of ducks, I am told by the experts on wildfowl and waterfowl, because of the drought situation.

Many of us belong to an organization called Ducks Unlimited, for which we pay \$2 or \$3 a year.

The Senator from South Dakota has just handed me a duck stamp. It may not be good for this year, but perhaps it will be good for next year.

We have been trying to conserve the great natural resources for the waterfowl. We have had excellent cooperation with the Canadian Government as to the breeding grounds north of the United States. Only recently we have had better cooperation with the countries of Latin and South America, where some of the ducks go. The enforcement there has been a very difficult problem.

The Mexican Government has been very considerate in regard to the problem. We never did get a treaty signed with Cuba, where the ducks are slaughtered in the winter season. I do not expect we will get a treaty now.

The program was proceeding slowly, but fairly well. The \$3 duck stamp will bring in between \$4½ and \$6 million.

A shortage of ducks and waterfowl has a direct effect on the amount of proceeds from the sale of stamps. If duck hunting is not very good, the duck hunters do not buy many stamps. We hope to increase the sale of duck stamps by doing the job of acquiring and preserving the wet lands. That is the reason for the bill being before the Senate.

The bill is a House-passed bill. The House passed it on July 10, 1961. There was little or no opposition to the objectives of the bill.

The House passed a bill to authorize appropriations of \$150 million over the next 10 years—that is, \$15 million a year—and provided that at least 75 percent of the proceeds from the sale of duck stamps would be returned to the Treasury, until the amount was repaid. The House-passed bill also provided that, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, at the end of 5 years, if the program was working out well, the price for the duck stamp could be raised from \$3 to \$4, and at the end of 10 years it could be raised to \$5.

The Senate committee decided we could meet that problem about the duck stamps when we got to it, and we allowed the \$3 charge for the duck stamps to remain, but we recommended authorizing appropriations of only \$50 million for the next 5 years; that is, \$10 million a year. This, would add to the moneys obtained from the sale of duck stamps, would bring in \$50 million for the purchase of wet lands to speed up the program.

We changed the provision with regard to 75 percent of the proceeds by making it mandatory that 90 percent of the proceeds of all duck stamp sales would be returned to the Treasury.

In effect, this is a program of borrowing a little from the Treasury.

We added an amendment to the bill—we do this, anyway, but thought we would make it more safe—to provide that no lands should be purchased under the plan unless the Federal Government and the State involved had a complete agreement, either with the Governor or the State agency, such as the State Game Commission in my State. It is provided that they must be in complete agreement as to the nature of the lands and the acreage involved.

I should like to point out certain significant figures. The Senate committee held hearings for two sessions. The House committee held quite lengthy hearings. Originally, when the program was started, 127 million acres of wet lands were available in the United States. Now only 22½ million such acres are available which are of any significant value. We have cut the number in half, and said that 12½ million acres would be a safe minimum to acquire. The Federal Government would hold

only 4½ million of those acres, and the remainder would be held by the States. In some cases there might be a coordinated program. Since July 1, 1960, all proceeds of the sale of duck stamps have been going for the acquisition of land and the enforcement of regulations, and that is the way we want the program to continue.

Most of the wildlife groups, such as the Audubon Club, Ducks, Unlimited, and others which are interested in State game commissions, were in favor of an acceleration of the program by the proposed method. If we were to operate the program as we should and acquire the small minimum acreage suggested, we might increase the waterfowl population of the North American Hemisphere to the extent that the amount of money received from the sale of the \$3 duck stamps might increase beyond the amount now received, which is between \$4½ million and \$5 million. If that were the case, and if an increase of 15, 20, or 25 percent took place, then, of course, the amount would come in every year, and would go back to the Treasury to repay the amount expended. There would be no cost except to those who purchase the stamps.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, I believe that a measure of the kind before the Senate is eminently justified. A unique plan has been devised whereby money could be made available at an earlier date than it would be if an accumulation of the fund were left to the proceeds of duck stamps.

There are two reasons for urgency. One is that some of the lands that should be acquired are going out of the market, so to speak. The second reason is that the price of the lands to be acquired is rising. For those reasons an acceleration of the program is greatly to be desired.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman one question. It has reference to the proviso that is proposed to be added at the end of the bill.

The committee amendment reads:

Provided further, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the bird migratory conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency.

In presenting the bill the Senator from Washington referred to the Governor. Does the chairman consider the proviso to refer to approval by the Governor, or approval by the appropriate State, or does he have in mind an act of the State legislature?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it is intended that the Governor or the appropriate State agency would give approval. In some States game commissions are established by State law. The members of the commission are appointed by the Governor and they have the control, responsibility, and authority on questions dealing with game laws.

In some cases there is a State game commissioner, who is merely a member of the executive branch of the State gov-

ernment. We wanted to provide for both types of State organization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I seek to do is to bring out the question of whether the language used would do exactly what the chairman has suggested. Would it not be better to have the proposed legislation read "has been approved by the Governor of the State or the appropriate State agency?"

The bill states "by the appropriate State."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that was an error. Does the Senator have the Senate bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a copy of the pending bill, H.R. 7391.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Senator from South Dakota would suggest that, on page 2, line 20, the language read:

Provided further, that no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the Governor of the State or the appropriate State agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is what I am suggesting. I am a little uncertain as to what is meant by the language "appropriate State or State agency."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see what the Senator means. I think his suggestion would clarify the language. I am glad to accept the amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as new text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to are as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "year", to strike out "1972" and insert "1967"; in line 11, after the word "comprising", to strike out "75 per centum" and insert "90 per centum"; in line 15, after the word "aforesaid", to strike out "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period", and in line 17, after the word "fiscal", to strike out "year." and insert "year: *Provided further*, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the word "appropriate" and insert the words "Governor of the", and on the same line, following the word "or", insert the word "appropriate".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the language would then read,

"been approved by the Governor of the State or appropriate State agency."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the Senator from Washington has referred to cooperation with Canada with respect to the area where ducks are produced. It is true that there is a drought in a portion of the great prairie country. It extends into Canada and the great natural breeding grounds there. For that reason steps in this direction are most important so that we can bring about the necessary conservation at the earliest possible date in order to conserve the natural breeding grounds of the migratory waterfowl.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot conceive of any acreage of wetlands that it is intended to purchase in the next 3 or 4 years that has not already had the joint approval of all the States and everyone else involved.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I have observed such procedure to be the practice in the 4 years in which I have been a member thereof. In spite of the absence of the type of amendment contained in the committee amendment, that always is the practice of the Commission. Normally at meetings of the Commission at which land is acquired, and approval of such acquisition is had, there are present representatives of the official appropriate agency of the State in which the land is located. There has already been processed before that time the area of agreement between the Federal agencies and the State agencies which makes the approval possible. So on that score I reassure the Senator from South Dakota, as well as the Senator from Washington, that the practice is already invoked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The matter was explained to some Members of the Senate, and some witness testified to it also, but it was felt that it might represent a little safeguard in case we were to run into it in one place or another.

Incidentally, I wish to return to the Senator from South Dakota his license. I would say to him that he will soon have to get a new one, because this is a 1960 license. It is a small game license, and the fee is \$2. Then there is a duck stamp here, \$3; also a wild turkey license in South Dakota, \$2. He will have to get a new one. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note that the duck stamp is good until the 30th of June, 1961.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, but the Senator will have to get a new stamp.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will get a new one as soon as a new duck season comes around again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A great deal of work and planning has been done to encourage the sale of more of these duck stamps. It is very significant to note that a great number of people who buy

the duck stamp do not hunt ducks. They want to preserve wildlife and wet lands. The purchase of these stamps is encouraged by many organizations, notably the Wildlife Federation, Field and Stream Magazine, by hunting and bird magazines, and many other organizations.

Mr. HRUSKA. Some of those who purchase the stamps do not use them at all. For example, Members of Congress whose sport used to be to go duck and geese shooting now just hope to go duck and geese shooting.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The Senator is looking at one of those Members of Congress right now.

Madam President, this is a good bill. It is a good program. I believe that in a year or two it will be a self-revolving fund. Perhaps 5 years from now we may need authority to raise the price to \$4. If so, I think we can do that, and find some justification for it. However, I believe we should go the way we are going.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the Senator from Nebraska understands, the jurisdiction and the processes of the Migratory Waterfowl Conservation Commission would not be in any way changed or altered by the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The purpose of all this is really to enact a finance bill to raise the wherewithal to do something that the Senator and his associates have recommended.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not a finance bill, inasmuch as it is an authorization bill subject to the regular appropriation process.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. What that amounts to is that it is subject to appropriations each year, and it amounts to a prespending arrangement for the revenues derived from the sale of the duck stamps.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; this coming year it will be, but I believe the revenues will catch up.

Mr. HRUSKA. The revenues which the sale of the duck stamp will produce can be spent in each of the next 5 years, in addition to the appropriated funds under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but later we are taking 90 percent of the proceeds of the duck stamp sales and putting them back into the Treasury.

Mr. HRUSKA. But not until 1967.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. It does not start until 1967.

Mr. HRUSKA. So until that time the Conservation Commission will be entitled to spend not only the proceeds from the sale of the stamp but also any moneys appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whatever Congress would regularly appropriate.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is for the purpose of accelerating the acquisition process of the wet lands, which are fast disappearing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Knowing the Appropriations Committee as I do, I would think that there would not be a great deal more over and above the proceeds

from the sale of the duck stamp that would be appropriated in the next 5 years.

Mr. HRUSKA. The proceeds from the sale of the duck stamp need not be appropriated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I said over and above that.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over and above that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Then what is the purpose of the bill? Starting with the fact that the duck stamp now produces about \$5 million in revenue, how much will be available in fiscal year 1963 with this bill ripening into law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we authorize the Senate version of it, \$10 million a year plus proceeds from the sale of duck stamps. The Department of the Interior would have authorization to come before the Appropriations Committee, in order to keep the program going, and ask for an extra \$10 million for that particular year.

Mr. HRUSKA. So that it would fill it out to the \$10 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. That was the understanding.

Mr. HRUSKA. The statement of the Senator from Washington was that \$55 million would be available if this law became effective.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Fifty million dollars for 5 years. That is \$10 million a year.

Mr. HRUSKA. Ten million dollars a year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is by way of authorization?

Mr. MAGNUSON. By way of authorization, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

VISIT TO UNITED STATES BY EXCHANGE BROADCASTERS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I call attention to the present visit in the United States of 21 radio and television broadcasters representing stations in Africa, Europe, the Far East, the Near East, south Asia, and South America. These visitors, all of whom hold important positions in the radio and television industries of their own countries, have come to America for the eighth consecutive year to study the advanced techniques of American radio and television broadcasting.

Under State Department sponsorship, the program is administered by the Television and Radio Center of Syracuse University, where the broadcasters will attend a special 4-week seminar. They will also spend considerable time in New York City to observe the operations of the major networks.

The last few weeks of their program will give each visitor an opportunity actually to observe and work in two different radio or television stations.

Madam President, the United States, and in particular New York State, has been in the vanguard of radio and television broadcasting since the origin of broadcasting. This exchange program can be of tremendous benefit to these visitors in showing them the operational

it in an 1816 letter to Samuel Kerchival. He said: "A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; the second for a third; and so on until the bulk of society is reduced to misery without sensibilities, except for sin and suffering. The forehorse of this frightful situation is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its train there is wretchedness and oppression."

In contrast with conservatism and no debt in Virginia, let us in conclusion examine the attitude and the situation in the Federal Government.

For more than 15 years the United States has been acting as the policeman for the free world, the banker for the free world, and the Santa Claus of the free world.

The Federal debt is increasing every day. The Federal deficit in the past year was \$4 billion. The Federal deficit in the present fiscal year may reach \$10 billion.

We continue to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and borrow and borrow, without regard for the consequences. Our dollar in the past 20 years has lost more than half of its purchasing power.

We have balanced the Federal budget only 6 times in 30 years. It is possible that the Federal budget may not be balanced for many years to come. On the basis of present proposals and current trends, the Federal Government may be spending more than \$100 billion a year within 3 to 5 years.

Recent Congresses appear to have totally disregarded the fact that the most sacred duty of the legislature is to act as trustees for the soundness of the Nation's future.

Congress today, and for the past 30 years, has looked only to the present; not to the future. It has allowed Federal debt to be piled on top of Federal debt, to be paid off by generations to come.

I have the positive conviction that no Member of Congress today will live to see the Federal Government pay off any part of the debt now being created every day. It will be passed on to our children and grandchildren. This is as wrong as it is unnecessary.

Every day new programs are presented to Congress for nonmilitary expenditures. It is proposed that we spend \$40 billion to go to the moon. If we go to the moon at all, we should go on a pay-as-you-go basis.

We are being asked to spend \$20 billion in Latin America, and give a blank check to the President for the purpose of making foreign loans in so-called less developed areas.

I offered an amendment in the Senate to provide for these expenditures, if at all, only to the extent of annual appropriations by Congress. When Congress, most closely representing the people of this country, loses the power over the purse to the executive branch, we shall have lost one of the vital instruments of check and balance in our system of government.

In all of this we are playing into the hands of Khrushchev. The Russian dictator is doing all in his power to destroy us from within. Our form of government and our free enterprise system are high on his list of prime targets.

This is the time for all of us to ask ourselves these searching questions:

How long can we continue to spend, tax, and borrow at the present rate?

Are we on a permanent deficit basis?

When will the breaking point come?

Profligate spending has gone hand in hand with concentration of power in the Federal Government. Can democracy survive if we impair our solvency?

Can we continue to move into a socialistic welfare state and preserve the freedoms that have made us great?

Should we not take warning from the fact that the purchasing power of the American dollar has declined sharply and is still going down?

We must reduce all nondefense expenditures which may be desirable, but not necessary.

It is imperative that we keep up our military strength, but this is not possible without fiscal preparedness as well.

In Virginia we understand that first things come first. The Virginia I know so well and love so much is not living in the past. We are vitally aware of the requirements of the present.

The trials Virginia has suffered, and her long experience, serve her well in reckoning with existing conditions and preparing for the future. Her progress is dependable, based on the principles she knows to be sound.

For all of these reasons, and probably more, Virginia's conservatism is a symbol throughout the Nation, and basically it follows the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and George Washington.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, first, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for having had considered in the Committee on Commerce, of which he is the chairman, the bill H.R. 7391 and also for his presentation of the bill before the Senate.

Madam President, I am a member of the Waterfowl Conservation Commission, of which serve not only two Members of the Senate, but also two Members of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Speaking from the experience I have had as a member of the Commission, I share the firm finding of the committee and its conclusions that there is a need for the accelerated spending of additional moneys from the public Treasury for the acquisition of the wetlands for waterfowl, for their increase and, in fact, in some cases, their preservation. It is only through that method that there will be precluded the possibility of those lands being used in the meantime for other purposes or reclaimed, as it were, and made unavailable for these uses in the years which lie ahead. Once they are gone, they will never again be available for these purposes.

There is one feature of the bill which I am particularly pleased; namely, that it is an authorization bill rather than a bill which would permit the drawing on the Treasury for the next 5 years of \$50 million without further reference to Congress and its regular appropriations processes.

The bill is an authorization bill. It authorizes the expenditure of \$50 million over a period of the next 5 years. As I understand, any amount which is appropriated by the Committees on Appropriations in the succeeding 5 fiscal years will be available for expenditure through the regular processes of the Migratory Waterfowl Conservation Commission in

addition to the funds which will be produced by the sale of duck stamps, to which reference has been made. I presume it will be up to the Department of the Interior and other interested agencies to appear before the Committees on Appropriations each year and present their justification for such amount over and above the amount required as the proceeds from the sale of duck stamps, but not to exceed \$10 million a year, and certainly not more than \$50 million in the 5 years, for the purposes which are outlined in the bill and also in the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Am I not correct in understanding that the bill provides for a backdoor spending method of raising these funds?

Mr. HRUSKA. I had not so understood. It is an authorization bill. It authorizes annual appropriations to be made in the regular course of business.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that explanation.

Mr. HRUSKA. I refer to section 2, beginning at the bottom of page 1, which reads:

SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for purposes of the migratory bird conservation fund established pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended.

There is also a statement in the first section of the bill, following the enactment clause, which reads:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the five-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 not to exceed \$50 million.

Does that answer the question of the Senator from New York?

Mr. KEATING. I am not certain that it does. Section 3 provides:

Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. The language continues:

Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1967, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund.

I do not know whether the bird conservation fund has anything to do with the Byrd amendment, but that language sounds to me very much like backdoor spending.

Mr. HRUSKA. Section 3 relates to the repayment to the Treasury from the migratory bird conservation fund. To that extent it is a "bird" amendment—spelled with a small "b" and with an "i" instead of a "y."

This language has nothing to do with circumventing the regular appropriation process, which is so dear to the hearts of the advocates of the Byrd amendments.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to have that explanation from the Senator from

Nebraska. I am certain it will serve its purpose in making the legislative intent clear.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am certain that the legislative history will be well established.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT BOARDMAN, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 86-500 of the 86th Congress.

Companion bills are being introduced today in the House of Representatives by members of Oregon's congressional delegation.

This measure is designed to clarify certain points raised by the Navy in connection with an exchange of lands involving a naval installation at Boardman, Oreg. authorized by the basic statute.

This matter is one which has been discussed with the Navy, the Governor of Oregon, and with Representative AL ULLMAN, of the Second Congressional District of Oregon, in whose district the lands are situated. It is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will give early and favorable consideration to this amendatory legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter dated August 25, 1961, to Senator RUSSELL, signed by the Governor of Oregon, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1961.

Re Boardman exchange legislation.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: During last year's session of Congress, your committee approved an amendment to the military construction authorization bill, which authorized the State of Oregon to acquire the Boardman Bombing Range, Morrow County, Oreg. This authorization contemplated an exchange of State-owned lands for the Boardman site with the State to provide the Navy with a complete substitute bombing range facility. Your action in this matter was sincerely appreciated by the people of the State of Oregon. Subsequently considerable progress has been made in carrying out the exchange plan.

In pursuing the plan as originally contemplated, a serious problem has developed. The site originally selected by the Navy was found to be limited in its usefulness as a training facility. As an alternative, the Navy has submitted a proposal which is acceptable to the State of Oregon and to its prospective lessee. This proposal calls for the Navy to retain a portion of the existing bombing range and to transfer a portion of the range to the State of Oregon in exchange

for lands the State will transfer to the Navy. This arrangement will actually expand the Navy's present training potential at Boardman.

The language in the existing act, section 207, Public Law 86-500, is considered by the Navy as too restrictive to permit accomplishment of its alternate or modified proposal. Amendatory language has been prepared by the Navy which provides the Secretary of the Navy with greater flexibility in carrying out the exchange. It retains the protective features incorporated in the original act. A copy of this amendatory language is attached and is satisfactory to the State of Oregon. The approval of the amendatory language at this time is a matter of great urgency, and it is our hope it can be passed during the current session. The Navy, the State of Oregon, and its prospective lessee are most anxious to consummate the transaction.

With your favorable consideration at this time, the transfer which you have previously approved will be greatly facilitated. This transfer will aid our national defense effort, expand our space program, and advance the economic development of the State of Oregon.

May I again express my appreciation to you for further considering this matter.

Sincerely,

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, let me state to the Senate that Public Law 86-500 provided for a land exchange in Oregon, involving the so-called Boardman site, which is owned by the Navy, and the so-called Wagontire site, which is owned by the State of Oregon. At that time it was felt that the exchange would involve the Boardman site and the Wagontire site, and Public Law 86-500 was drafted in order to bring about that exchange. Thereafter it developed that the Wagontire tract would not be serviceable to the Navy in carrying out the Navy program. So it is necessary to evolve another land exchange. The Navy takes the position that in order to cover the new arrangement, it will be necessary to have Public Law 86-500 amended.

I wish to assure the Senate that there is nothing substantial in these amendments, and no change in the original public policy is involved. Yet we are faced with a time limit. All of us recognize that it will be difficult to get the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee to take the necessary committee action on this measure before adjournment, unless there is clearance by both the Senate leadership and the House leadership. Since time is of the essence—because the Boeing Co. is anxious to begin its operations on the site; but until the land exchange can be legally completed, the Boeing Co. will not proceed to invest its funds in developing these operations on land over which it does not have legal control—we urge very, very prompt action.

All we can say publicly at this time about the matter—as the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, my distinguished colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who joins me in submitting this measure this afternoon, well knows—is that the exchange is of importance to the security of the country.

It would be most unfortunate if action on the exchange were delayed simply

because of the necessity to add some minor amendments to the existing law, in order to put the Navy in a position in which there will be no question of its legal authorization to complete the exchange. It would be extremely unfortunate if we had to wait until January to accomplish this objective.

Therefore, Madam President, in introducing the bill today, all I can say is that the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee will be visited by the two Senators from Oregon personally, undoubtedly, in the next few days, with a plea for quick clearance on this matter, so we can get the measure to the floor of the Senate by the end of this week, I hope.

Let me say to the majority leader that I am referring to an amendment which my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I are introducing this afternoon to Public Law 86-500, the land exchange law passed at the last session. Our amendment provides for an exchange of land in Oregon, so that the Boeing Aircraft Co. can proceed with a testing program which is of importance to the security of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon state the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. It does not yet have a calendar number; I introduced the bill only a moment ago, on behalf of myself and my colleague. I am explaining why time is so important in connection with the bill. It involves only a technical matter. At the last session the Senate passed Public Law 86-500, which at that time involved an exchange of land between the Navy and the State of Oregon, involving the Boardman site, owned by the Navy, and the so-called Wagontire site, owned by the State of Oregon. After the Navy sought to carry out the arrangement, it found that the Wagontire site would not meet its needs. So the Navy has worked out another arrangement with the State of Oregon; and the new arrangement calls for only minor amendments to the existing law, so there can be an exchange of Navy land and Oregon State land. The Boardman site is to be divided, and some State land is to be added to it. But the Navy legal staff says it will be necessary to add some minor amendments to Public Law 86-500.

However, the difficulty is that the Senate Armed Services Committee is not holding frequent meetings; neither is the House Armed Services Committee.

So the two Oregon Senators will do their very best to get the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee to take their word for this matter, so to speak, because we have worked out this matter with the Navy, and we are proposing only what the Navy wants—namely, to have the law amended so that the State of Oregon and the Navy and the Boeing Aircraft Co. can make the necessary arrangements, in order to permit the Boeing Co. to make the necessary installations for the vitally important testing arrangements.

Since time is of the essence, I want the majority leader to know that I shall urge

on the Senate Armed Services Committee—just as our colleagues of the Oregon delegation in the House of Representatives will urge on the House Armed Services Committee—that immediate clearance be given. But, lacking that, I am prepared to offer this measure as an amendment to any measure which comes before the Senate. However, I hope that course will not be necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I shall be prepared to discuss the matter with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and we shall do our best.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the majority leader. There is no dispute about this matter. I know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will, as always, give us complete cooperation; but time is running against him, too.

Because this is only a technical matter, and because the Navy and Boeing Co. need to have these amendments made almost immediately, in order to patch up Public Law 86-500 so as to give the Navy the necessary technical legal authorization, I sincerely hope we can succeed in having this matter handled almost pro forma by the Senate Armed Services Committee, by having it take the word of the two Senators from Oregon as their bond, because we are not requesting anything that is not completely in line with existing law. However, the legal technicalities require that the Navy request that these minor amendments be made to the existing law.

Today, I have introduced the amendments, in the form of a bill, on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself; and I have had printed in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of Oregon to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I shall supply all the necessary supporting data.

My plea is that very, very prompt action be taken, so that these amendments can be enacted into law before the adjournment comes.

The major reason for these amendments is that the Boeing Co. believes this action must be taken before it proceeds with its testing arrangements, which I assure my colleagues are most important in connection with certain testing operations which the Boeing Co. is doing for the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2476) to amend section 207 of the Military Construction Act of 1960 in order to clarify the authority granted under such section to the Secretary of the Navy to exchange certain lands owned by the United States for lands owned by the State of Oregon, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with the details of this matter and whether or not the Defense Department has made a report on it, but I can assure the Senator I will have the staff of the committee examine into it and see if it is possible to take the matter up at our next meeting.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator the Defense Department wants such amendments. That is where we got them.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, turning to another matter, I wish to place in the RECORD and make brief comment on an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 23, entitled "Liberty, Not Tax Aid."

This editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in eloquent and condensed form, presents my whole case on the school issue as between public and private school legislation. I respectfully recommend to the advocates of aid to private schools—and I yield to none of them in my determination to seek to get legislation to aid private schools within the framework of the Constitution and subject to the restrictions of the first amendment of the Constitution—this St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial. They are going to have to face up to a bombardment of such editorials and public comments, in my judgment, if the advocates of aid to private schools persist in taking the position that they will use their power in this country to prevent the passage of public school legislation unless we capitulate to the private school forces in this country and either pass private school aid legislation first or concurrently with public school aid legislation.

If the advocates of private school Federal aid want that fight, then we had better get it behind us. But it is not in the interest of the private schools and it is not in the interest of American school children to get involved in that kind of controversy. It is unnecessary, and it is particularly unnecessary when among us here in the Senate are men who have been fighting for the legitimate interests of private school education in this country.

I said the other night, when I answered Cardinal Spellman, that I was well aware of the fact it is not polite to take that stand. But that is no new position for me to be in. I need only satisfy myself that I am right, and when I am right, there is no force in this country—even the powerful private school advocates—that will deter me in my course of action.

As I said to the educational director of the archdiocese of my State, who wrote me a letter in protest of the position I had taken on this issue, in which he stated he would like to take me before groups of Catholic parents in Oregon so I could see the temper of those parents, I would welcome that opportunity. But I respectfully suggest that he familiarize himself with the temper of the Congress, because here is where I have to do my legislative work. I have not changed my position in the slightest in support of the Clark-Morse bill for aid to private schools; and I ask the Catholic leaders of the country, "What is wrong with that bill? Why do you not start giving us support for that bill, rather than take the position that we have to

follow your legislative procedure or be confronted with your political opposition?"

We will take that, too, if that is the way it has to be; and, in this free society let a free people decide the result. But, as I said to the director of education for the Catholic Archdiocese in my State, I want him to understand it makes not one whit of difference to me what political opposition I get in my State from his group or any other group; it will not change the stand of the Senator from Oregon on the merits of any issue. In the face of that kind of opposition, the Senator from Oregon will continue, so long as he is in the Senate, to press for a constitutional bill that provides aid to private schools within the framework and limits of the first amendment.

But again I say it is my hope that the advocates of private school legislation will cooperate with those of us who have the responsibility of seeking to take through the Senate of the United States sound and fair legislation both for public and private schools.

Madam President, I think the St. Louis Post-Dispatch put this case in an unanswerable and clear statement when it said in its editorial:

LIBERTY, NOT TAX AID

Cardinal Spellman no doubt reflects the views of many persons of his faith when he argues that it is anti-Catholic discrimination to deny public tax support for parochial schools. But the argument will not stand up. What he is saying, in effect, is that schools which teach a particular religion have the same right to tax support as schools which teach no religion. They do not.

The sponsors of public aid for parochial schools have tried to convince the country that all they are asking for is educational freedom, the civil rights of parents to determine what kind of education their children shall have, the right of parochial school pupils to equality.

Able proponents of this viewpoint have presented the issue as one of doing justice to minorities. The United States is a pluralistic society, they say, and the followers of all religious faiths are entitled to full religious liberty. They argue that if public school aid is withheld from parochial schools, then the Government will be penalizing those families which as a matter of conscience insist on a religion-oriented education for their children; and the penalty will impair that family's religious liberty.

With all due respect to the many Roman Catholics who sincerely hold such views, we believe this line of reasoning overlooks several elements of the problem.

The followers of every religious faith (and the followers of none) do indeed have a right to full religious liberty. But this does not mean they have a right to obtain financial support for indoctrination in their particular faith from the followers of other faiths, and the followers of none. It would be just as logical to say that unless the Government builds all the churches, religious liberty is being impaired.

The basic characteristic of the public school is that it is open to all children and does not impose upon any the tenets of a particular religious faith. The public school is founded on the principle that its business is nonreligious education, and that religious training can properly be provided somewhere else.

Many families, no less devout than others, accept this functional division by sending their children to public school and relying

upon home or church for religious training. Others who feel this arrangement to be inadequate are at liberty to insist upon combining religious training with general education in one school. But they cannot fairly demand the right to do so at public expense.

The reason is that it is fundamentally wrong to tax one family to pay for the propagation of another family's faith. This is the underlying and profoundly wise principle upon which the constitutional doctrine of church-state separation rests. American society is indeed a pluralistic one, but to remain so it must insist that public schools remain public, which means that they shall not meddle in religious training; and that taxes derived from all the people shall be reserved to schools that serve all the people.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy's opposition to Federal aid for education unless it includes aid for parochial schools has already, we think, sharpened religious divisions. They would be sharpened still more, and would affect our political life in an unhealthy way, if tax funds became the object of a political scramble among the various creeds. The best, the socially most cohesive, and the constitutional way to deal with this matter is to tax nobody for the support of any particular creed, and to tax everybody for the support of nonreligious public schools.

Madam President, this outlines pretty clearly the point of view—and it is a widespread point of view in this country—of those who do not agree with the Catholic leaders that the legislative procedure must take up concurrently public school and private school aid legislation or even, more preferably, take it up in the same bill.

I say from the Senate Chamber again today, in my judgment, the clear duty owed by the elected representatives in the Congress is to take to the people of this country a public school aid bill and then also, in a separate bill, to take to them a private school loan bill. The loan bill should provide for an interest rate to cover the cost of the use of the money; in other words, the taxpayers should give to the private school people no concealed subsidy.

Madam President, we have proposed legislation before the Senate to accomplish that purpose. I say now, most respectfully, I think all we need for the ultimate passage of the legislation either before we adjourn this fall or early in the next session is the understanding cooperation of the advocates of the private school legislation, not the kind of attack and opposition and criticism some of us have been getting because we have simply taken the position, "We do not care from where the opposition comes; we are interested only in the merits of the issue."

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I repeat that I shall continue to stand for Federal aid to public schools in a separate bill and Federal aid to private schools in a separate bill, within the limitations of the Constitution of the United States. If the spokesman for private schools are really interested in loans for their own schools and not just in blocking improvements in the public school system, I invite them to join with me in trying to obtain enactment of both these bills. In any case, I shall not be deterred from my legislative course of action by their opposition any

more than I am deterred from seeking loans for private schools by Protestant objections, which certainly are far more potent in my State of Oregon.

No Catholic child in America, in either public or private school, will profit from the obstruction of the public school bill. Second-rate public schools will mean a second-rate America, and what Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish child is going to be better off then?

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, this is certainly not a difficult bill, in the sense that it is short in text and states very plainly what it proposes to undertake. As a part of my remarks I think I ought to read the text of the bill into the RECORD.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the five-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$50,000,000.

When the bill passed the House of Representatives on July 10, 1961, the text was substantially the same, except that it provided a 10-year program and encompassed not to exceed \$150 million.

I gather, according to those who have a way of calculating interest on items of this kind for a long repayment period, that the charge under the House bill would probably aggregate \$120 million before the program was consummated, and under the Senate bill the interest would probably aggregate some \$13 million, to be reimbursed over a period of 11 years.

Madam President, there are a number of reasons why I feel that some legislative history ought to be made and why I ought to interpose an objection to the bill.

First, it uses the old technique of earmarking funds, if that is what is sought to be done, to ultimately take the money out of the duck stamp fund, even though the bill itself makes no affirmative provision on that score.

I understand the Bureau of the Budget had an objection on the ground that there was no hint of an increase in the duck stamp price to \$4, and then subsequently to \$5, depending upon how long it would take to defray the amount involved.

This is a technique we are slipping into gradually, of finding an easy source of revenue somewhere and then earmarking it, diverting it for specific purposes, always, of course, at the expense of the general funds flowing into the Treasury of the United States.

This is to be regarded as an advance, and it is to be noninterest bearing. It would appear to me to have a little of the flavor of back-door spending, about which we have heard so much recently.

I understand this is at variance with the program of the President of the United States. If the President has asked for this, I have not seen it in print. The President rather emphasized the fact that something ought to be done about wetlands in the Midwest and Northwest sections, on the grounds that those were important, but I do not believe the President indicated we ought to set up a fund, which could easily be increased over a period of years, under which the program would simply move all over the United States of America where there are migratory waterfowl. After a little while, States and groups and individuals would come to the Congress to ask to be included in the program, to ask to build up the funds, with increasing demands year after year, until the program became one of those amazing commitments in the fiscal structure. Then we would wonder how it got there.

This is another excess over the President's program. It is interesting with what impunity the Congress undertakes to go beyond the confines of the good fiscal policy laid out by the President.

With that blithe spirit, when the housing bill was before the Senate, we approved, if we total up all the housing provisions, \$1.4 billion above the President's program. We approved the military procurement program. No one quarreled about the President's request with respect to defense and the survival of the country. But a spirit of benevolence and generosity pervades Congress. We thought we would do the President one better, so we gave him \$596 million more than he requested.

When the space program was finally approved we were openhanded. Evidently there is money lying around loose everywhere. In effect we said to the President, "We will do better by you. Instead of giving you what you asked, we will give you \$227 million more."

A Youth Conservation Corps is proposed. I do not know who is asking for it, but if my figures are correct, and such a corps is established and extends over a period of time, the ultimate commitment will amount to \$1,400 million.

Recently the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, presented an interesting bill to pursue the science of oceanography. I know that the deep sea divers want the measure. I know that the people who like to walk around on the bottom of the ocean want it. I know it is fun to look through a test tube at marine organisms that are brought out of the briny deep. Perhaps in due course such studies will have some value. I feel that if the program were continued year after year in a modest fashion, we could consummate some of the objectives in that field. But when the Senate finished consideration of that bill—and I raised my voice against it—we had committed the Treasury, so to speak, for \$603 million.

A GI bill will be coming along from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

What will be the ultimate commitment under that bill? There will be a fine built-in sum of \$2 billion. When the measure is enacted, we shall have to pay the bill at some time, because it will create a built-in commitment in the Federal structure.

It seems to me that Members of the House and the Senate ought to take time off and read the statement prepared by the former Budget Director Maurice H. Stans. Incidentally, he was one of the ablest men who ever graced that office. In his statement he called to account all the built-in commitments made and what they add up to. They run into the hundreds of millions, including officers' retirement, GI benefits, subsidies for the maritime program, and that sort of thing.

The cost will have to be paid by those who come after. I have often said capriciously and sarcastically, "What fun it would be if my great-great-grandchildren could only be around to see what fun their great-great-granddaddy might be having in spending what they will be required to pay back." That is what it amounts to.

I have tried to resist a great many bills, and I resist the one now before the Senate. I would like to make provision for ducks and give the sportsmen of the country a chance.

Nothing brightens a day so much as to see a mallard with its wings outstretched, a body containing a perfect aeronautic structure, sailing out and moving down. We see him get the little feathers at the edge of his wings properly placed. He brings his feet up and makes a landing that would put any airplane and any pilot to shame. Nature has provided this ability for the mallard. The gray goose from Canada will do the same thing.

I am not a real outdoorsman, but I love nature. I love best to watch birds. No one can say that I have no interest in them. Only yesterday, when I should have been at a desk thinking up points on the steel issue for discussion sometime later this week, I sat for nearly an hour, on the bank of the stream where I live and watched a white heron. What a beautiful sight to see that long-legged fowl finally pull in his neck, extend his feet behind him, streamlining first his legs and then his feet. It was a sight to behold that revitalizes one's faith in the Almighty. Waterfowl have an amazing natural structure that we call life, and all the beauties that are in it. So no one can say that I have no interest in wildlife.

But I never get away from the fact that from day to day we are living with a structure of government that must be made to function properly.

It must be kept within fiscal bounds in the hope that not only our own generation but the taxpayers who come after—the children, the grandchildren, the great-grandchildren—will not regard what we did in this time and generation with a baleful and cynical eye and say, "What a tragic and dismal inheritance

we got from our great grandpappies back in the decade of development—the 1960's."

So I want to keep the program in proper form.

We have done better than the budget request in the so-called oceanography program, the GI bill, and also the Health, Education, and Welfare program. We included \$156 million more than the budget requested.

It is an amazing sequence. The agency says, "We need so much." Instead of giving the agency what it requests, we say, "We will give you more."

Representatives of the agency say, "We cannot find the talent to use the funds you propose to give us."

We say, "We will try to find the talent for you."

If we go out and raid the communities of the land for research personnel and doctors, and bring them down to the great citadel of Washington for the purpose of spending the appropriated money, then, of course, we shall hurt the professions back home.

In the Defense appropriation fund we added \$750 million to the amount requested.

How openhanded can his body be? How careless can we be? How can we ignore the fiscal problems that are presently before us and ignore also the warnings of the President and the requests of the President from time to time?

I heard a portion of the steel discussion the other day. The danger of inflation was mentioned. The possibility that a price increase in the steel industry would rock the boat and fan the fevers of inflation all over again was discussed. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] talked about the deficit in the previous fiscal year, which ended on June 30, and the deficit that we could foresee in the next fiscal year. It is wonderful. Perhaps we shall have a \$6 billion, a \$7 billion, or \$8 billion deficit in the following fiscal year. Yet the Director of the Budget will blithely talk about a balanced budget. I would like to see it balanced as we go. I would like to see the money rather than speculate as to whether or not there will be sources that can be tapped in order to make up the deficit and keep us in a state of balance.

We have a structural unemployment problem. "Structural unemployment" is a great disarming and euphemistic term. A newspaperman asked me about it the other day. I said, "Oh, that is merely a term which means built-in unemployment, and if it were so called instead of 'structural unemployment,' I think everyone could understand what was meant."

However, I like euphemistic terms. I am reminded of the lady who was having her family tree examined. Unfortunately they found one brother who had occupied the electric chair in Sing Sing. The genealogist who was doing the work did not particularly want to state that fact.

He hunted for something which would get around that fact and still tell the truth. At long last, at that part in the

genealogical treatise he wrote: "There was one brother who occupied the chair of applied electricity in a large public institution." [Laughter.] That is a wonderful way to say it. I like the euphemism about structural unemployment. It is here. It is built in. Everyone wants to do something about it. It will command a little more attention than the acquisition of wet lands at a time like this, when we are dealing with money that we do not have.

Madam President, there is not a line in the whole legislative lexicon that intrigues me so much as the first line in every appropriation bill which comes to the floor of the Senate. Everyone knows what it is. It says: "There is appropriated out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." There are no funds in the Treasury when we are in a deficit position. The necessity for this has not been shown. Who knows what the commitments on the Federal budget will be? In proportion as the fiscal affairs of the country are lightly dealt with, the impact will not be only on the duck hunters, but it will also be on every man, woman and child in the country if the inflationary fevers beset us again. It is because of that larger interest that I resist the bill.

That is all I need to say about it. I hope it will not prevail. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I remind the Senator from Illinois that a few years ago a group of sportsmen and conservationists who were just as much interested in ducks as he is, and who wanted to have a place for ducks to land, when they spread their pin feathers and bend their feet forward, instead of having to land on concrete pavements or dry farms, so they would have wet lands on which to nest and fly from and grow up on, came to Congress, the Senator from Illinois will remember, and said, "Put a tax on us. Sell a duck stamp that every duck hunter in America must buy. Make it a dollar. We will use the money to buy the wet lands necessary, so we can preserve the ducks and the waterfowl population of America."

They asked for the tax. Congress acquiesced. We put that tax on them and we made the amount of the tax \$1. We required every duck hunter to buy a duck stamp for \$1. We said that the money would be used to purchase wet lands. Then they returned to Congress and they said that they wanted us to make it a \$2 tax, because we were not acquiring the wet lands fast enough. Congress again acquiesced with the de-

sires of the people who wanted this tax imposed on them.

In the last administration, in order to balance the budget, someone down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue got the bright idea that we did not need to use the money for the purchase of wet lands; that it would be a good idea to take the money and use it for the administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Accordingly, we have been using the money for that purpose, instead of using it to buy wet lands. So since the last administration we have been using it to pay salaries and expenses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can agree pretty well with what the distinguished Senator says. I defy him to find a line in the bill which will have any impact on the conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture under which they dry up lands. Now we will acquire wet lands. Is it not about time, before we come in with a bill like this, for some of these agencies to get their ducks in a row and reconcile these programs before we get to this kind of proposal?

Mr. METCALF. I welcome the support of the Senator from Illinois for a bill which I have introduced.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why does not the Senator get his provision written into the bill which we are considering today before we come to a vote on it?

Mr. METCALF. I want to get one thing done at a time. The only thing we want done now is the job that we promised these people we would do when we established the duck stamp fund, and when we said we would use that money for the purchase of wet lands. The Senator from Illinois has been talking about how much interest would accrue on this interest-free money. How much interest would accrue on all the money that was diverted for administrative expenses in the last administration? How much interest would accrue on the money that was used illegally?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. METCALF. How much is it going to cost us to acquire the lands today that could have been acquired about 2 or 3 or 5 years ago out of this fund that was diverted? It seems to me a matter of common equity to do this for the duck hunters, which is the thing that they asked us to do and that we promised to do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the Senator would support a motion to recommit the bill to committee, and then to have the agricultural conservation specialists come to Congress and help us write into it all the necessary provisions, so that at long last we will have a bill in which we are not going in opposite direction, buying wet lands on the one hand, and the Department of Agriculture doing its level, vehement best to dry up lands.

Mr. METCALF. I would not support such a motion, because the Senator from Illinois will recall that such a pro-

vision was added to the bill previously, and in conference somehow or other it was dropped out of the bill. These are not soil conservation lands. These are all sorts of lands that are on the market and open for purchase.

The senior Senator from Nebraska and I were on the commission in charge of passing upon such land as will be purchased. He knows as well as I do that many of these lands have never been used in soil conservation. Sometimes we are acquiring hunting lodges and hunting rights which are going to be used for other purposes, and some of them will be drained and used for airports or something like that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am going to ask the distinguished Senator, when the public works bill comes to the floor, to look at all the projects and note how many drainage and levee districts are going to get money out of the Federal Government to build levees higher, to make levees wider, to keep out river water so it will make it possible to produce rice and corn and just about everything else. For years I have fussed against it, when they first trotted out what was called the Jadwin plan, to move the water away, to get it into the river course, and to get it to the Gulf of Mexico.

We got into it, and we have been into it ever since that time. What does that amount to? With money taken from the Federal Treasury, the river bottoms are being taken away, bottoms which the Almighty meant for the waterfowl. If that is not at cross-purposes with what is provided in the bill, then I have never seen it.

Mr. METCALF. It may be at cross-purposes, but if we are to keep faith with those who have come to us and said, "Tax us so that we can acquire, out of the money we have contributed to the Federal Government, some wet lands in order to breed and perpetuate the waterfowl of America," we will have to pass such a bill as this. Those funds have been diverted for several years. They have been used for purposes other than those which were provided in the bill.

Yes, some soil conservation districts are being drained. Levees are being built. But let us buy some land for waterfowl breeding purposes. Let the Federal Government purchase such land and let it be administered under the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Instead, the money which has been contributed by duck hunters through the purchase of stamps has been used for other purposes, including administrative expenses.

In order to keep faith with the duck hunters, it is time for the Federal Government to buy land, while such land is still available, and to advance the money from the Treasury, so that the 12½ million acres of wet land can be acquired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let the Members of the Senate decide whether to spend \$50

million to buy wet lands while the Army Engineers are building levees to take away the wet lands, and the Department of Agriculture introduces a soil conservation program to drain those lands so as to get the water more quickly into the water courses. That does not make a logical, sensible pattern.

Before this kind of bill, which authorizes the expenditure of \$50 million, is passed by the Senate, we ought to come back and make certain that all these provisions are harmonized. Then the chances are that the minority leader would give his vote for the bill.

Mr. METCALF. It is necessary to have both kinds of projects. It is necessary to drain lands. It is necessary to drain them for soil conservation purposes. It is necessary to have levees to protect agricultural lands along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. At the same time, it is necessary to save some wet lands for breeding grounds for waterfowl.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Actually, as the Senator from Montana knows, even though he does not come from a State which has the flood control problems of States like Louisiana—for the most part, his State is a high, arid State, while Louisiana is one of the low, coastal plain States—we have the problem in the spring of getting the floodwater off the land, and in the summertime and fall the problem of finding water to put on the crops. There is nothing new about that situation in Louisiana. We know what it means to have floods and droughts in the same year. Floods usually come at one time, and droughts at another time. At one stage of the proceeding, the problem is to keep the floodwaters from destroying homes or washing them away and destroying crops. Later in the year the problem is to get enough water on the land before a drought strikes. So we have two problems, not only in one section of the State, but in many parts. In one part of the year we have too much water; in another part of the year we do not have enough. The way to handle the situation is to solve both problems.

The results of the latest studies which have been made show, to my knowledge, that all the money which has been spent on flood control in the whole Mississippi River Valley, the entire investment, would not equal the cost of 1 year's damage from the type of flood we had in 1927.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. He has also stated another fact. In my part of the country, where the nesting grounds of the northern birds are located, it is necessary to have some swampy wetlands. They are not a part of flood control projects at all. In the early spring, when the snow melts in the mountains, it is necessary to conserve the water, so that floods would not occur in the lower reaches of the great rivers, and as far down as Louisiana. It is not agricultural land that is to be acquired in this program. The land which will be acquired is the

land which is not useful for agricultural purposes or any other purposes except as nesting and breeding grounds for the propagation of waterfowl.

It is necessary to have flood control projects. We must develop all of them that we can. Water must be impounded for irrigation purposes and to enable navigation all the way down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Facilities must be provided to prevent floods in Louisiana. That is why the water in the upper reaches must be impounded in the spring. But all that has nothing to do with the problem which confronts us concerning the kind of land which is sought to be acquired by the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the committee report on page 2, beginning with the title "Wetlands," and a letter from the Department of the Interior addressed to the chairman of the House committee on May 10, on the bill, which ends with the statement:

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WET LANDS

The Nation, to be successful in its objective of preserving sufficient habitat to sustain our migratory waterfowl must step up its wetlands acquisition program. With only present duck stamp revenues available, we cannot hope to achieve our goal of acquiring the additional lands in less than 40 years.

We need to have not less than 12½ million acres of wet lands under public control in the 48 contiguous States. These lands must be properly distributed throughout nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. At this time a total of 5½ million acres is already in public ownership, 3½ million acres under control of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and 2 million acres controlled by the States. The four flyway councils have determined which areas should be given priority attention and which new projects should be acquired and whether with State or Federal funds. Under this agreement, subject to annual revision, it is planned that of the 7 million acres to be acquired, the Federal Government will acquire 4½ million acres and the States the remaining 2½ million acres.

The Fish and Wildlife Service advised your committee that of the 127 million acres of wet lands once available, over 80 percent have been either destroyed completely or their wildlife value seriously reduced by man's activities. Each year since 1949 over 1 million nonfarm dwelling units have been built in suburban areas. Many real estate developments involve the filling in of coastal marshes and estuaries. New industries are located on reclaimed land along our rivers. Marshes and swamps are being annihilated in the construction of highways and airports. Millions of acres of wet lands have been drained to provide additional agricultural land. In the northern prairie States about one-half of the important waterfowl production habitat has been destroyed through drainage.

Of those 127 million acres of wetlands in the United States, now less than 23 million acres are of significant value for migratory waterfowl.

Your committee held public hearings on H.R. 7391 and a companion Senate measure

(S. 2175) introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. The legislation was vigorously supported by all witnesses; no one appeared in opposition.

This bill, according to its proponents would provide funds for wetlands purchases while that land is still available and enable the acquisition to be made during a period when the cost is estimated to be less than in later years.

The preservation of these wetlands will provide a substantial contribution to the national water conservation program. They will also preserve and create a much needed recreational potential, need for which will continue as our population increases. Then, too, these wetlands are essential to many forms of wildlife and will provide habitat for many birds and animals.

Your committee is of the opinion that a large share of this appropriation will be used to purchase lands in areas where recreational opportunities are becoming more and more important to our citizens.

COSTS

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$50 million over a 5-year period. This sum with the anticipated revenue of \$25 million from the sale of duck stamps over the same period would make available \$75 million. After 5 years the bill would provide that 90 percent of the duck stamp funds would be returned to the Treasury until the \$50 million loan is repaid and the lands would then be held for migratory waterfowl refuges debt free.

The bill would provide that funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be treated as an advance, without interest to the migratory game fund. Your committee is of the opinion that the public benefits from this program justify placing the interest burden on the public. The entire cost of the program is to be paid by the duck hunters from their \$3 duck stamp, but all of the lands purchased with this money would be owned by the United States.

THE AMENDMENTS

On line 7, page 1, strike "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period".

On line 8, page 1, strike "\$150,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 2, line 8, strike "1972" and insert "1967".

On page 2, line 10, strike "75 per centum" and insert "90 per centum".

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period".

On page 2, at the end of line 15, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided further, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency."

AGENCY REPORTS

Reports from the Department of the Interior and the Treasury Department on similar legislation, submitted to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., May 10, 1961.

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER,

Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BONNER: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 4603, a bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes. This report is applicable also to the identical bills, H.R. 4624 and H.R. 6133.

We urge that this proposed legislation be revised and enacted in accordance with the attached redraft thereof. Such draft incorporates certain changes that are self-explanatory and which we feel are desirable in carrying out the object of this proposal.

This proposal will authorize a significant and highly desirable program of land acquisition for the benefit of the Nation's migratory waterfowl. We believe that it will provide a practicable means of stepping up such land acquisition activities, with the ultimate costs thereof being financed with duck stamp revenues. This is generally consistent with the policy already established by the Congress for the use of such revenues.

Such a program is desirable, we believe, due to the fact that various factors—our rapidly increasing human population, continuing urban and industrial expansion, as well as various agricultural and other land drainage programs and activities—are having a very adverse effect upon our migratory waterfowl, i.e., principally ducks and geese. Marshes and swamps have been ditched, dredged, drained, burned, filled, paved, and polluted to meet the demands of modern civilization for more agricultural lands, more industrial sites, more urban housing developments, more roads, and more airports, etc.

It is significant to note that there were originally in the 48 contiguous States some 127 million acres of wet lands; however, by 1955 this total acreage was reduced to approximately 74 million acres. Of this amount only 22.5 million are now of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. Each year this acreage shrinks considerably. Time is running out in the race to preserve our migratory waterfowl. These factors are reducing the natural habitat available to our migratory waterfowl and are creating an urgent need for well-considered countermeasures. The only solution, we believe, is an expansion in the Federal land acquisition program for the benefit of our migratory waterfowl resource. Unless appropriate action is taken soon, very serious losses to this resource will result.

Although considerable areas of wet lands and other suitable waterfowl habitat are still available in certain places, opportunities for acquisition thereof are disappearing rapidly. Pressures for other use and development of these areas are increasing. Land costs have continued to rise. In carrying forward our refuge acquisition program, we are handicapped frequently by a lack of sufficient funds with which to acquire, when they become available, many of the excellent properties that are needed for these purposes.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, it should be noted that an important step has been made toward accomplishment of the goal that we are convinced is desirable in providing adequately for our migratory waterfowl population. The Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, as amended by the act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 486; 16 U.S.C. 718d), requires that beginning on July 1, 1960, all net revenues from duck stamp sales be used for the purchase or lease of lands for these purposes. We expect future revenues from this source to range from \$5 to \$6 million each year; however, because of the adverse factors previously indicated, we must emphasize that these duck stamp revenues will be grossly inadequate. They will permit only very gradual acquisition of the needed properties. Consequently, an accelerated land acquisition program is urgently needed in order that we may obtain, while they are still available, those important wet lands and other wildlife habitat areas that are essential for our migratory waterfowl.

This proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed \$20 million a year over a 10-year period; however, it should be noted that under the terms of this bill, these funds would be paid back out of duck stamp revenues, beginning in 1972. Our proposed revision would eliminate the annual limitation which we believe is unnecessary. Appropriations made during the 10-year period, when merged with the duck stamp revenues may be expected to

provide a total of some \$200 million during the 10-year period. In order to carry out this program in the manner and scale that we believe it should be carried out, we estimated that \$10 million could be obligated for land acquisition in fiscal year 1962; \$12 million in 1963; \$19 million in 1964; \$23 million in 1965; \$25 million in 1966-67; \$23 million in 1968, and \$21 million in 1969-71. We anticipate that such expenditures would be sufficient to acquire title or lease approximately 3,960,000 acres of waterfowl lands. We would expect to acquire title to approximately 2,810,000 acres and to lease or acquire easements to approximately 1,150,000 acres. This amount of acquisition and control of land for waterfowl conservation purposes would comprise 88 percent of the total of 4.5 million acres that we consider to be a desirable ultimate goal for such acquisition by the Federal Government. At the end of the 10-year period we would expect to continue land acquisition with 25 percent of the duck stamp revenues, as indicated under the terms of our suggested revision, until the remaining acreage is obtained. The remaining portion of the duck stamp revenues, 75 percent under the terms of our redraft, would be used for repayment of the funds advanced for land acquisition.

The need for Federal and State cooperation and progressive action in perpetuating the Nation's waterfowl resources has become generally recognized.* Public ownership or control of 12.5 million acres of key wet lands in the 48 contiguous States is highly desirable. It is essential that these lands be properly distributed throughout the nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. This Department now manages some 3.5 million acres for this purpose and the States manage some 2 million acres of suitable waterfowl land. Under the Federal-State program that we envision, the Federal Government would acquire the additional lands to which we have referred previously in the amount of 4.5 million acres, and the States would acquire the remaining additional 2.5 million acres, thereby bringing the total acreage under public management of waterfowl resource conservation up to 12.5 million acres.

So far as Federal expenditures are concerned, the income from the \$3 duck stamp, which is earmarked for this land acquisition program, will repay the cost of the Federal portion of such program, as indicated by the terms of this proposed legislation. In this connection, you will note that our suggested revision contains a provision that will permit an increase in the cost of the duck stamp to \$4 after the first \$50 million has been advanced, unless the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of pertinent factors, determines that such an increase is unwarranted and contrary to the public interest. A similar \$1 increase in the price of the duck stamp would be made after the advancement of the second \$50 million unless the Secretary finds that such an increase is not in the public interest.

We anticipate full cooperation by the States in carrying forward this program. We believe this proposal is in the public interest because it will permit Federal acquisition of these important waterfowl lands while they are still available and at less cost than would be the case if such acquisition is carried out over a long period of time.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I recognize the fact that a

considerable argument could be made in favor of the bill. That is true of many bills. However I also think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made an excellent argument from the standpoint that we should wait until we have the money. We should postpone some of these projects until the Federal budget is balanced.

The Senator from Montana points out that this program was started years ago by charging duck hunters a dollar apiece for stamps, the money to be used for the acquisition of wetlands. The fee for the stamp was subsequently raised to \$2 and later to \$3. As he stated, since that time some of the money received has been diverted to pay administrative costs. The bill, however, does not correct that situation.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I do not have the report before me, but the report shows that in July 1960, amendments to the act provided that none of the money could be diverted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is in the report. I am speaking of the bill.

Madam President, even though this program may be meritorious if our fiscal policies are to be kept on a sound basis it will be necessary at some point to curtail some of these spending proposals until such time as there is enough money. With that in mind, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "fiscal year 1962" and insert in lieu thereof "the first fiscal year following the close of a fiscal year with a balanced budget."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the amendment would enable Congress to put its stamp of approval on the program, but the financing of the program would begin when money was available to pay for it. After all, Congress should do either one of two things: either the program should be postponed until such time as the money is actually available to pay for it, or the bill should be accompanied with a provision for an additional tax increase which would pay for the cost of the program. The bill as it is presently written does not do either of those things. Let those who like these spending programs vote also for the necessary taxes at the same time.

I wonder if the chairman of the committee would not be willing to recommit the bill, as the Senator from Illinois suggested, or to postpone its effective date until such time as the budget is balanced and we have sufficient money available to pay for it.

Let it not be said that the duck hunters shot a hole in our Federal budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I could not accept the amendment because this is a House-passed bill. It was reported unanimously by the House committee and unanimously by the members of the Senate committee who considered it. We are not dealing with the taxpayers' money as such; we are dealing with the money which the duck stamp buyers put into the Treasury under a

pledge which was made at the time the first act was passed.

I was the author of the \$2 duck stamp bill several years ago. At that time the duck hunters were told that the revenue derived from the sale of duck stamps would be used to acquire wet lands.

We have learned that for the past 9 years about 50 percent of that revenue was going into the Treasury and was not being used for the acquisition of wet lands.

Two or three years ago, I introduced a bill which provided that all the money acquired from the sale of duck stamps, with the exception of a minor amount to defray the cost of printing the stamps, should be spent directly for the acquisition of wet lands. In the meantime, the program bogged down.

Now all that the people who are interested in the program are asking is that the money which they paid to the Government through the purchase of the \$3 duck stamps be used for the acquisition of wet lands. At least 90 percent of it should be used for such purchase; the rest is to be used for the enforcement of some minor regulations. Ninety or ninety-five percent of the equity paid in should be used. In the meantime, in order to get the program underway, the Treasury is being asked for a certain amount as an advance.

In any case it must be approved every year by the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee; they must even approve the amount to be put into the trust fund. So this amendment is entirely different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection whatever to having the full \$3 collected by the sale of these stamps used for the acquisition of wetlands but that is not what this bill provides. I have just as much interest in the program as does the Senator from Washington or anyone else.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure of that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have never missed a year buying duck stamps. I enjoy duck hunting as much as anyone else does, although I may say that if the other duck hunters have no better luck than I do, there will always be many ducks in the air.

I would agree to a further increase in the cost of the stamp if that is necessary, but it must be used in a proper manner. However, this measure does not provide for that. This is just a flat \$50 million appropriation at a time when we already have an unbalanced budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The point is that once the program of acquiring 2½ million acres is finished, every dime received by means of the sale of duck stamps can be used to repay any amount that is owed, or anything else, or for the enforcement of regulations to improve the lands. Once the lands are acquired, the program will be through.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Washington has been here longer than most of us have, and he knows very well that there is no such thing as getting through with a program once a Government agency gets it started. Government agencies have more lives than the proverbial cat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest that if something is not done, we shall soon be through with the ducks, the geese, and the other waterfowl.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I think we should either recommit the bill or else postpone its effective date until the Government has the necessary funds.

In this case, the bill does not provide for additional revenue, and the Senator from Washington does not suggest any other means of obtaining the necessary funds than to borrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I think the Senate did pretty well with the bill. The House version of the bill, which was passed unanimously by the House, called for a program which involved 3 times the modest amount the Senate voted for. Furthermore, some of the land is rising in value every year. Whatever the Government pays for these wetlands is a good investment, and is good for the country in many respects.

No additional appropriations will be necessary. The committee must merely reappropriate the money which goes into the Treasury as a result of the sale of the duck stamps.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, it is true that the House unanimously passed the bill. But that was long before the Berlin crises had developed. It was before the President said that all of us have to sacrifice on our pet projects. It was before the increased arms program was put into effect; when the House acted the Secretary of the Treasury was making representations that we would have a balanced budget and perhaps would soon be able to reduce taxes.

However, today we are confronted with an unbalanced budget, as a certainty; and the only question is how much the budget will be unbalanced.

Therefore, present circumstances are far different from those which existed at the time when the House acted on this bill.

I repeat that if we do not stop spending on some of these programs, where will this end?

Does anyone think we can provide all the funds that are requested for all such programs and all the necessary funds for the military programs, and at the same time keep taxes where they are now? I am sure the Senator from Washington will not advocate higher taxes. But if we keep on spending and do not have higher taxes there will be inflation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, the Senator from Delaware refers to this measure as if it were my personal bill. But I merely represent the committee. The committee, after due deliberation, decided that the program is in the interest of the welfare of the country.

I am sure the President did not suggest at any time that we close up shop and not do some of the things which should be done to strengthen the country. We could appropriate an infinite amount of money for the building of airplanes and the construction of tanks, and we could draft an innumerable number of men, and could do everything

which one might want for the defense of the country—and of course the Senator from Delaware and I support the necessary defense measures—but all that will not be worth very much unless some of the things needed to keep America strong are also done. Certainly the defense program does not require Congress to close shop on all the other necessary programs. The President never suggested that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did the President suggest this program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course I have heard the President speak about the crises and about how we have to tighten our belts. But that is like ringing a dinner bell, for those who are not in favor of many of the necessary programs. It happens many times.

The letter was sent to the committee, and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior testified. I now read from the letter again:

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

The enclosed draft called for some technical amendments.

There was no contrary testimony before the Senate committee, and we held hearings and invited all interested persons to attend.

The funds involved are not tax funds. In a sense the funds belong to those who purchased the duck stamps and are interested in the development of the program, which calls for the purchase of these lands.

I, too, buy duck stamps. I do not know whether the hunting in my State is as good as is the hunting on the Eastern shore of Maryland. But I shall try the hunting there, too, someday.

All who have studied this matter—including the Migratory Bird Commission, of which the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nebraska are members—have agreed that this should be done; and that is why the bill is now before the Senate.

Of course, we could act to stop many bills. I think there are many things we do not need to proceed with; I agree with the Senator from Delaware about that. But I think this is a good bill; and, in my opinion, if we do not start this job now, we shall be very sorry in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the Senator from Washington has read from a letter in which it was stated that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the bill. Is the Senator from Washington aware of the fact that the letter is dated May 10, 1961, long before the recent Berlin crisis?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I said the letter was sent to the House committee, and I said that in testimony received no later than last week he repeated the statement he had made in the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the letter from which the Senator quoted is dated May 10, 1961.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course it is. That letter was sent to the House committee. Then he testified before our committee not more than 2 weeks ago, and said that he took the same stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not question the Senator's statement, but I have not seen any other letter. I do not doubt that he has stated the matter correctly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have said that after he sent that letter, he appeared—not more than 2 weeks ago—before our committee and reiterated the stand he took in the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If there is a subsequent letter, where is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been read a third time. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may place in the RECORD at this point the testimony of the Department of the Interior before the Senate Committee on Commerce, as presented by Assistant Secretary of Commerce, July 31, 1961.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRANK P. BRIGGS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a very, very short statement, because I realize how busy all of you are over here.

I am here this morning to support the views of our Department. I take it that you have the Department's report.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. We will put that in the record in full.

Mr. BRIGGS. President Kennedy, in his natural resources message to the Congress early this year urged an immediate acceleration of the wetlands acquisition program.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has stressed the critical need to bring 4 or 5 million additional acres of wet lands into our national wildlife refuge system before these lands are lost by drainage or filling—or priced beyond the reach of the public purse.

In the past year, many leading conservation agencies have campaigned vigorously for a crash program to save the Nation's waterfowl habitat and we are most gratified to have their support in this field. May I add

that several of them are here to add their endorsement to this bill.

It is obvious that the annual revenue our Department receives from duck-stamp sales—about \$5 million—is not enough to get duck habitat restored in the short time we have to restore it.

As Secretary Udall has said: "What we save now (today) may be all we'll save. In this case, time is our enemy."

Our goal is the acquisition by the Federal Government of an additional 4½ million acres for refuge and waterfowl production purposes.

We hope to get control of about 4 million of these acres within the next 10 years. This should put us over the hump.

We estimate that this will cost \$200 million and require an advance of \$150 million to be merged with the \$50 million expected to be available from duck-stamp revenues in the next 10 years. This proposed advance will be repaid to the Treasury from duck-stamp revenue accruing after fiscal year 1971.

We urge your favorable consideration of this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. CARLSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 168]

YEAS—65

Alken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Allott	Hickey	Morton
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Beall	Holland	Mundt
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Boggs	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Capehart	Jordan	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Keating	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Russell
Church	Long, Mo.	Scott
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Cooper	Long, La.	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Magnuson	Stennis
Dworshak	Mansfield	Symington
Ellender	McCarthy	Talmadge
Engle	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Wiley
Fong	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Monroney	

NAYS—8

Bennett	Goldwater	Tower
Dirksen	Prouty	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—27

Anderson	Chavez	Kefauver
Bridges	Cotton	Kerr
Burdick	Dodd	Lausche
Bush	Eastland	Muskie
Butler	Gore	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Schoeppel
Cannon	Hartke	Smith, Mass.
Carlson	Humphrey	Sparkman
Carroll	Javits	Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 7391) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1908) to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6453. An act for the relief of Earl Cupton; and

H.R. 5179. An act for the relief of the U.S. Display Corp.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1022. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; and

H.R. 6244. An act for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services erroneously in receipt of family separation allowances.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 3596. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to Purvis C. Vickers, Robert I. Vickers, and Joseph M. Vickers, a copartnership doing business as Vickers Bros.;

H.R. 6765. An act to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock;

H.R. 8599. An act to amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 438. Joint resolution to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to authorize and direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations; and

H.J. Res. 544. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, and for other purposes.

THE PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN SHORELINE AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 624, S. 543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 543) to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 3, line 1, after the word "Minnesota," to strike out "De Bidue Island, South Carolina; Kiawah Island, South Carolina;"; in line 3, after the word "Virginia", to strike out "and" and insert "Great Salt Lake, Utah; Lake Tahoe, Nevada-California;"; in line 4, after the words "North Carolina", to insert a semicolon and "and the shores of Hawaii"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "adopted", to insert "under appropriate laws and regulations"; in line 6, after the word "to", insert "administer, operate, and"; in line 13, after the word "section", to strike out "if such conversion, use, or disposal is continued for more than one year within the twenty-five year period immediately following the acquisition of such property by such State;"; in line 17, after the word "therefor", to insert "from such", and in line 22, after the word "of," to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of promoting the preservation, development, and accessibility to all Ameri-

11. PASSED OVER the following bills:
- H. R. 6775, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences. p. 17305
 - H. R. 6141, to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of retirement annuities to retired Federal employees. p. 17305
 - S. 1633, to provide for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. p. 17309
12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated that S. 2180, to establish a U. S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security, will be considered next, followed by consideration of the Mexican farm labor bill. p. 17414

HOUSE

13. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 7035, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1154) (pp. 17429-31). The bill includes \$20,250,000 for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Conferees were granted until midnight Fri., Sept. 8, to file a conference report on H. R. 8302, the military construction appropriation bill. p. 17493
14. RICE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9013, to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where a producer withdraws from the production of rice (H. Rept. 1150). p. 17495
15. CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8914, to permit producers on farms on which summer fallow is a normal practice to plant barley on land devoted to summer fallow during 1961 which is diverted from wheat under the 1962 Wheat Stabilization Program provided an overall reduction of 20% is made in corn, grain sorghums, and barley (H. Rept. 1149). p. 17495
16. WHEAT. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8842, to permit a wheat producer to withdraw from his stored excess the amount of wheat by which he fails to make his normal production on the reduced acreage allotment, less the acres voluntarily retired below the allotment (H. Rept. 1148). p. 17495
17. SUPERGRADES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 7377, to increase the limitation on the number of supergrades, and on the number of research and development positions of scientists and engineers for which special rates of pay are authorized (p. D825). The committee was granted until midnight Thurs., Sept. 7, to file a report on this bill (p. 17423).
18. WATERFOWL. Disagreed to the Senate amendments and conferees were appointed on H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. p. 17426
19. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7927, to adjust postal rates (H. Rept. 1155). p. 17495

20. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered favorably reported H. R. 8565, to permit certain Government employees to elect to receive compensation in accordance with section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, in lieu of certain compensation at a saved rate. pp. D824-5
21. FOREIGN TRADE. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered favorably reported H. R. 7791, to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics. p. D825
- Passed as reported H. R. 7692, to amend section 304 of the Tariff Act to provide that when articles, which are imported in containers that are now required to be marked to show in English the name of the country of origin of such articles, are repackaged in the U. S. and offered for sale, the new packages shall be marked to show the country from which the materials originally came. pp. 17427-9
- Agreed to without amendment H. Res. 403, to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949. pp. 17433-45
22. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 6732, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage the construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17446
23. PEACE CORPS. Rep. Dorn stated that the proposal to establish a Peace Corps is wrought with potential danger to U. S. prestige by sending inadequately trained and indoctrinated personnel into foreign countries. pp. 17446-7
- The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7500, to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower. p. 17495
24. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Saylor criticized what he termed "an unholy alliance between the fanatical public power zealots and the Bureau of Reclamation who are using the reclamation program for the promotion of subsidized Government power." pp. 17450-7
- Rep. Ashbrook said the Government's "getting deeper" into the electric power business is a "serious and dangerous trend which can and must be reversed." pp. 17461-3
25. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that the Labor-HEW and the military construction appropriations conference reports will be considered on Monday; the public works appropriation bill on Tuesday; the conference report on Atomic Energy Commission appropriations authorization, the Peace Corps bill, H. R. 6360, relating to an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and the supplemental appropriation bill for 1962, on Wednesday and the balance of the week. pp. 17481-2
26. ADJOURNED until noon Monday, September 11.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

27. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley inserting an article in which a Wisc. dairyman reports on a tour of farm areas in Soviet countries. pp. A7035-6
- Extension of remarks of Rep. Alexander inserting Under Secretary Murphy's address before the annual meeting of the North Carolina Feeder Manufacturers Association, Virginia Beach, Va. pp. A7061-3

15. The Chairman inquired about entertainment and recreation for the cadets. The Superintendent discussed the availability of movies in the auditorium, the work of the social director in helping cadets with their formal and informal dances and in imparting to them some of the necessary social graces of an officer, the Academy-wide lecture series, and the widespread entertainment of cadets in the homes of officers and other residents of New London and vicinity. The Superintendent also spoke of his concern for the recreation of enlisted men and of his encouragement of the establishment of a White Hat Club and a Chief's Club both in the present and to-be-constructed enlisted men's barracks.

16. The head of the physical education department, in response to a question, explained the physical education courses, the intramural sports program, and the varsity sports program. In connection with the latter he indicated that about one-third of the Cadet Corps participated in each of the three seasons—fall, winter, and spring. He stressed the smallness of the Academy gymnasium for the 600 cadets and indicated the real need for more playing fields.

17. A general discussion ensued on the continuing improvements in the library, both with respect to personnel and book acquisition. The increased use of the library by cadets in the evening, the improved cataloging for research purposes, and the assignment of more research papers by the various departments demonstrate the cooperation and dedication of the present library staff. The Superintendent commented that the Board and headquarters had helped greatly through the establishment of two new civilian positions in the library.

18. The Board then recessed until after the review of the corps of cadets.

REVIEW OF CORPS OF CADETS AND MEETING WITH CLASS REPRESENTATIVES

The corps of cadets honored the Board of Visitors with a formal review. Immediately following the review, the Board met with representatives of each cadet class and the regimental staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy unanimously approved the following recommendations:

1. The Board heartily approves the construction program carried out at the Academy between fiscal years 1959 and 1961. The Board is in accord with the construction program planned for fiscal year 1962 through fiscal year 1968.

However, the Board considers it mandatory that the remaining wooden structures be replaced and that physical education facilities be expanded and improved with least practicable delay. Accordingly, the Board is recommending to the Secretary of the Treasury and hereby earnestly recommends to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that this program be speeded up so as to provide for its complete accomplishment (except for extension of the cadet messhall and construction of one additional cadet barracks) by the end of fiscal year 1965; the excepted items (cadet messhall and barracks) are to be completed, as soon after fiscal year 1965 as necessary.

2. The Board strongly supports the program of increasing and improving the faculty as outlined by the Superintendent.

3. The Board considers that the pay and perquisites given to a cadet are not pay for service rendered, but are an allowance made to him for his support in his preparation for service to be rendered after graduation; accordingly the Board is recommending to the Secretary of the Treasury that such pay and perquisites be exempted from income tax.

CONCLUSION

The Board of Visitors wishes officially to take note of the outstanding record of accomplishment achieved by the Superintendent, Rear Adm. Stephen H. Evans, in little more than a year in his present position. It is obvious to the Board that his leadership has produced improvements in the curriculum, staff, facilities, and the morale of the cadets. The Board also wishes to commend the dedicated staff for their efforts in maintaining the high standards of this institution and the excellent caliber of the cadet corps. The Board wishes to extend its thanks to Vice Adm. J. A. Hirshfield, Acting Commandant; Rear Adm. H. J. Wuensch, Chief, Office of Personnel; Capt. G. R. Boyce, Jr., Chief of the Training and Procurement Division; and Capt. Mark A. Whalen, liaison officer, for the assistance rendered to them. The Chairman and members of the Board wish to express their appreciation to the regimental officers and other members of the cadet corps for their very helpful assistance to the Board in expressing their view on the functioning of the Academy. The Board earnestly recommends to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that they assist in every way possible in bringing the Coast Guard Academy to the attention of eligible candidates, and urging their constituents to participate in the nationwide examination to be held on 19 and 20 February 1962.

HERBERT C. BONNER, *Chairman*,
BENJAMIN A. SMITH II,
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
ALTON LENNON
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
GEORGE P. MILLER

DANGEROUS TRENDS OF OUR TIMES

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WHITTEN'S remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

INVESTIGATION OF CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

(Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to explain what my special order will be today. Other Members of the House have expressed interest in this. I called the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] about it. It is in regard to a letter that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has sent to many of the charitable foundations in regard to what is, I suppose, an investigation he is conducting. There are certain House procedures and committee procedures involved. I have taken 30 minutes special order, in order to discuss these matters. I talked with the gentleman from Texas this morning so that he would know that was the subject for discussion under my special order.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on page 17148 of yesterday's RECORD, where

my name was erroneously entered as "Mr. HRUSKA," be correctly recorded under my name, and that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FREE DELIVERY BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported out a bill to increase postage rates. As a member of the committee I am not happy with the bill as finally passed. More than three-fourths of the increase will fall on the users of first-class mail.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that the committee adopted my amendment to the bill which has the effect of prohibiting the delivery of Communist political propaganda by the U.S. postal system.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment reads as follows: In furtherance of this authority to counteract adverse usage of the mails and to reduce the domestic postal deficit, no international mail handling arrangement under which any postal rate, whether or not reciprocal, is established, shall permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the U.S. Post Office Department of mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda. Section 2 of the amendment states that no U.S. postal rate established in the bill shall be available for the receipt, handling, transportation, or delivery of mail matter determined by the Attorney General of the United States to be Communist political propaganda financed or sponsored directly or indirectly by any Communist controlled government.

I hope that Members of the House, Members of the other body, and the administration will give their full support to this amendment because the present free delivery by the Post Office of Communist propaganda which seeks to destroy us is scandalous.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 192 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 452) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Kansas.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: THOMAS M. PELL, Washington.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BONNER, GEORGE P. MILLER, DINGELL, PELL, and ELLSWORTH.

IDENTIFYING NUMBERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8876) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the use of identifying numbers, unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(a) IDENTIFYING NUMBERS.—Subchapter B of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (miscellaneous provisions relating to information and returns) is amended by renumbering section 6109 as section 6110 and inserting after section 6108 the following new section:

"SEC. 6109. IDENTIFYING NUMBERS.

"(a) SUPPLYING OF IDENTIFYING NUMBERS.—When required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate:

"(1) INCLUSION IN RETURNS.—Any person required under the authority of this title to make a return, statement, or other document shall include in such return, statement, or other document such identifying number as may be prescribed for securing proper identification of such person.

"(2) FURNISHING NUMBER TO OTHER PERSONS.—Any person with respect to whom a return, statement, or other document is required under the authority of this title to be made by another person shall furnish to such other person such identifying number as may be prescribed for securing his proper identification.

"(3) FURNISHING NUMBER OF ANOTHER PERSON.—Any person required under the authority of this title to make a return, statement, or other document with respect to another person shall request from such other

person, and shall include in any such return, statement, or other document, such identifying number as may be prescribed for securing proper identification of such other person.

"(b) LIMITATION.—

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a return of any person with respect to his liability for tax, or any statement or other document in support thereof, shall not be considered for purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) as a return, statement, or other document with respect to another person.

"(2) For purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), a return of an estate or trust with respect to its liability for tax, and any statement or other document in support thereof, shall be considered as a return, statement, or other document with respect to each beneficiary of such estate or trust.

"(c) REQUIREMENT OF INFORMATION.—For purposes of this section, the Secretary or his delegate is authorized to require such information as may be necessary to assign an identifying number to any person."

(b) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO SUPPLY IDENTIFYING NUMBER.—Subchapter B of chapter 68 of such Code (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6676. FAILURE TO SUPPLY IDENTIFYING NUMBERS.

"(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—If any person who is required by regulations prescribed under section 6109—

"(1) to include his identifying number in any return, statement, or other document,

"(2) to furnish his identifying number to another person, or

"(3) to include in any return, statement, or other document made with respect to another person the identifying number of such other person,

fails to comply with such requirement at the time prescribed by such regulations, such person shall pay a penalty of \$5 for each such failure, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause.

"(d) DEFICIENCY PROCEDURES NOT TO APPLY.—Subchapter B of chapter 63 (relating to deficiency procedures for income, estate, and gift taxes) shall not apply in respect of the assessment or collection of any penalty imposed by subsection (a)."

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by striking out the last line and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6109. Identifying numbers.

"Sec. 6110. Cross references."

(2) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 68 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6676. Failure to supply identifying numbers."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) of section 6109(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall apply only in respect of returns, statements, and other documents relating to periods commencing after December 31, 1961. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section 6109(a) shall apply only in respect of returns, statements, or other documents relating to periods commencing after December 31, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and I be permitted to extend our remarks imme-

diately following the passage of this bill and another bill to be considered in order to explain the bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 8876, is designed to improve enforcement and collection of internal revenue taxes by facilitating the expanded use of automatic data processing equipment by the Internal Revenue Service and by enabling the Service to match information returns now filed with tax returns. It provides specific statutory authority for the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to require taxpayers to obtain and use identifying account numbers in their transactions with the Internal Revenue Service. Where other persons are required to file various tax documents, such as information returns, and include therein the account numbers of taxpayers, the bill provides that such other persons shall request these numbers from the taxpayers concerned and that the taxpayers shall furnish their numbers to them.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will recall that legislation to authorize the use of taxpayer account numbers was recommended by the President in his Tax Message to the Congress earlier this year. Under present law, the use of such numbers is already required with respect to taxpayers who are subject to social security taxes and to income tax withholding on wages. This means that the vast majority of taxpayers already have account numbers since between 85 and 90 percent of all individual tax returns presently filed show a social security number. However, this new authorization extends to all returns made for the purpose of disclosing the amount of tax for which a taxpayer is liable—regardless of the type of tax involved—and also to all information returns, statements, and other documents.

Mr. Speaker, in testifying in support of this legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury stated as follows:

The assignment of an account number to each taxpayer is indispensable to the effective operation of the system of automatic data processing which the Internal Revenue Service is now establishing. It is generally recognized that such a system utilizing modern mechanical methods of collecting and processing tax data is essential to a continued effective collection and enforcement program. A pilot processing installation located in Atlanta, Ga., encompassing the seven Southeastern States, is scheduled to begin operation in January of 1962. The need for identifying numbers is therefore apparent.

The Internal Revenue Service has indicated that it intends to use social security numbers as the account numbers in order to minimize the number of persons having to be assigned new numbers. Also, to the maximum extent possible, applications for account numbers will be mailed to those who do not presently have such numbers in order to minimize the burden imposed on taxpayers.

- range (S. Rept. 965), and H. R. 2281, to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area (S. Rept. 966). p. 17704
3. EDUCATION. Continued debate on S. 2393, to extend for one year the authority for Federal assistance for the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas. pp. 17746, 17759-90, 17800-09
4. PERSONNEL. Conferees were appointed on S. 739, to remove the present requirement, contained in the Pay Act of 1960, that ASC county committee employees with past service purchase credit for such service within a two-year period from July 10, 1960, to modify the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, and to provide for permanent indefinite appropriations for the retirement fund. House conferees have not yet been appointed. pp. 17707-8
5. WATERFOWL; WETLANDS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential habitat. House conferees have already been appointed. p. 17708
6. MILK. Sen. Humphrey inserted an editorial, "U. S. Milk Legislation," commending Secretary Freeman for supporting legislation to provide for the establishment of national milk sanitation standards. p. 17753
7. FOREIGN AGRICULTURE. Sens. Humphrey, Aiken, and Morse commended the program for the settlement of Dutch farmers in Brazil. pp. 17754-7
8. FORESTRY; WILDERNESS AREAS. Sen. Church inserted a summary of the major provisions of S. 174, the wilderness areas preservation bill. p. 17736
9. FEDERAL EXPENDITURES. Sen. Wiley urged the establishment of a permanent "Hoover-type Commission to keep a watchful eye on Federal expenditures." p. 17726
10. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Bennett urged that private industry be granted authority to construct transmission lines to serve the upper Colorado project. pp. 17728-30
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Agreed to a unanimous consent request by Sen. Mansfield providing that for the remainder of the session items on the calendar to which there is no objection may be called up at any time. pp. 17709-10

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cooley reviewing "for the Members of the House the work of this Congress, thus far, in behalf of agriculture," and outlining the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1961. pp. A7093-5
- Extension of remarks of Rep. Johnson, Wis., inserting an editorial, "Freeman Lays It On The Line," which states that, "to his everlasting credit, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman cast political caution to the winds when he testified on the national milk sanitation bill..." pp. A7141, A7143
23. EDUCATION. Speech in the House by Rep. Colehan expressing his regrets that "constructive proposals" dealing with aid to education were not passed in this session of Congress. p. A7096
24. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Extension of remarks of Rep. Denton commending this Department's rural areas development activities and insertion of a statement by the Department "Progress Report on Rural Areas Development." pp. A7097-8

25. TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS. Rep. Aspinall inserted a report by the High Commissioner of Trust Territory to the United Nations Trusteeship Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which includes a statement on agricultural activities in that area. pp. A7098-102
26. SURPLUS FOOD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel and insertion of a magazine article on the cost of food donations to the needy. p. A7106
27. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Cannon extended his remarks and inserted "up-to-date tabulations on the status of the regular appropriation bills and identified legislative bills carrying back-door provisions of one kind or another." pp. A7107-9
28. PESTICIDES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell inserting an article, "Controlling the Pesticides," and saying, "it is indeed a happy sign to observe that one of our country's leading newspapers recognizes the grave danger of haphazard use of these extremely toxic and dangerous substances." p. A7117
29. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Alger inserting his weekly newsletter discussing foreign aid and saying "My own position is opposed to foreign aid until it is used in the self-interest of the United States." pp. A7123-4

BILLS INTRODUCED

30. LANDS. H. R. 9115, by Rep. Aspinall, to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to Interior and Insular Affairs.
31. WHEAT. H. R. 9116, by Rep. Dole, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to establish a uniform base period for the 1962 wheat program; to Agriculture Committee.
32. EXPENDITURES. H. R. 9121, by Rep. Weaver, to help maintain the financial solvency of the Federal Government by reducing nonessential expenditures through reduction in personnel in various agencies of the Federal Government by attrition; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
33. SUGAR. S. 2526, by Sen. Humphrey, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to Finance Committee. Remarks p. 17705
34. MINERALS; WATER. S. J. Res. 136, by Sen. McGee, to determine the susceptibility of minerals to electrometallurgical processes; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks pp. 17812-4

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS SEPT. 12:

Supplemental appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec).
Acquisition of wetlands, conferees (exec).

oOo

(1) two members chosen from the membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of whom one shall be a member of the majority party and one shall be a member of the minority party;

(2) two members chosen from the membership of the Committee on Appropriations, of whom one shall be a member of the majority party and one shall be a member of the minority party;

(3) two members chosen from the membership of the Committee on Government Operations, of whom one shall be a member of the majority party and one shall be a member of the minority party;

(4) two members chosen from the membership of the Committee on Armed Services, of whom one shall be a member of the majority party and one shall be a member of the minority party; and

(5) four members chosen from members of the Senate without regard to their committee assignments, of whom two shall be members of the majority party and two shall be members of the minority party.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(c) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate. A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(d) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

(e) The committee shall cease to exist on February 28, 1962.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation concerning the situation existing in the Congo.

(b) On or before January 1, 1962, the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendations for any additional legislative or other measures which it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the solution of problems incident to that situation.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than \$1,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and

the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The telegram presented by Mr. DODD is as follows:

TEXT OF WIRE FROM SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD TO AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON

I am gravely concerned over reports of recent action taken by the United Nations in the Congo.

On the one hand, I am alarmed by the role of the United Nations in fostering the creation of a coalition government in Leopoldville with Antoine Gizenga as Vice Premier and Christophe Gbenye as Minister of Interior. Both of these men are Prague-trained Communists.

On the other hand, I am alarmed by the massive concentration of U.N. forces in Katanga, by the forcible arrest and deportation last week of all white officers and noncommissioned officers serving with the Katanga Army, and by the increasing number of white civilian advisers who have been ordered deported.

By thus decapitating the anti-Communist army of President Tshombe, by leaving the large pro-Communist army of Antoine Gizenga intact, and by forcing the submission of President Tshombe to the highly questionable coalition government in Leopoldville, the U.N. command, in my opinion, is preparing the way for a Communist takeover in the Congo.

I have this morning submitted a resolution calling for the creation of a select committee of the Senate to investigate the situation in the Congo.

It is the duty of the Senate to investigate and to be fully informed about the situation in the Congo as it affects American interests; the role played by the United States in determining or opposing U.N. policy; and the use being made in the Congo of the money of American taxpayers.

There have been reports in the past indicating that the Department of State was not satisfied with the U.N.'s handling of the Congo situation. I earnestly hope that the Department has not approved the recent measures to which this telegram refers. I urge you to insist within the U.N. that, until there has been an opportunity for a reappraisal of the entire situation, the U.N. command in the Congo take no further action against white officers or white advisers in Katanga Province; that it release those officers and advisers now in custody and permit them to resume their positions; and that it take no further measures to force the submission of President Tshombe to the coalition government in Leopoldville, in which the Vice Premier and the Minister of the Interior are both Prague-trained Communists.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO METHOD OF COMPUTING CERTAIN INTEREST EARNINGS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 739) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, which were, on page 1, line 3, after "That" insert "(a)"; on page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "(70 Stat. 759 (5 U.S.C. 2267))" and insert "(70 Stat. 759; 5 U.S.C. 2267(d))"; on page 2, after line 18, insert:

(b) All special issues in which the civil service retirement and disability fund is invested in accordance with section 17(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act shall be redeemed and the moneys reinvested by the Secretary of the Treasury on or before January 1, 1962, in accordance with such section 17(d), as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (74 Stat. 302; 5 U.S.C. 2252(h) (2) and (3)), are amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to accept the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee with respect to service, for purposes of this Act, of the type rendered by employees described in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

"(3) Subject to the provisions of sections 4(c) and 9(f) of this Act, service rendered prior to July 10, 1960, as an employee of a county committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) or of a committee or an association of producers described in section 10(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 37), shall be included in computing length of creditable service for the purposes of this Act."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective as of July 1, 1961.

SEC. 3. Section 11(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (74 Stat. 409; 5 U.S.C. 2261(h)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(h)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any employee—

"(A) who is separated from the service prior to July 12, 1960; and

"(B) who continues in the service after July 12, 1960, without break in service of one workday or more,

shall be granted the benefits of paragraph (1) of this subsection as if he were separated after July 12, 1960."

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 7(d) and 7(e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (70 Stat. 750, 751; 5 U.S.C. 2257(d) and (e)), are amended to read as follows:

"(d) If such annuitant, before reaching age sixty, recovers from his disability, payment of the annuity shall cease upon reemployment by the Government or one year from the date of the medical examination showing such recovery, whichever is earlier. If such annuitant, before reaching age sixty, is restored to an earning capacity fairly comparable to the current rate of compensation of the position occupied at the time of retirement, payment of the annuity shall cease upon reemployment by the Govern-

ment or one year from the end of the calendar year in which earning capacity is so restored, whichever is earlier. Earning capacity shall be deemed restored if, in each of two succeeding calendar years, the income of the annuitant from wages or self-employment, or both, shall equal at least 80 per centum of the current rate of compensation of the position occupied immediately prior to retirement.

"(e) If such annuitant whose annuity is discontinued under subsection (d) is not reemployed in any position included in the provisions of this Act, he shall be considered except for service credit, as having been involuntarily separated from the service for the purposes of this Act as of the date of discontinuance of the disability annuity and shall, after such discontinuance, be entitled to annuity in accordance with the applicable provision of this Act. In the case of an annuitant whose annuity is heretofore or hereafter discontinued because of an earning capacity provision of this or any prior law and such annuitant is not reemployed in any position included in the provisions of this Act, annuity at the same rate shall be restored effective the first of the year following any calendar year in which his income from wages or self-employment, or both, is less than 80 per centum of the current rate of compensation of the position occupied immediately prior to retirement, if he has not recovered from the disability for which he was retired. In the case of an annuitant whose annuity is heretofore or hereafter discontinued because of a medical finding that the annuitant has recovered from disability and such annuitant is not reemployed in any position included in the provisions of this Act, annuity at the same rate shall be restored effective from the date of medical examination showing a recurrence of such disability. Neither the second nor third sentence of this subsection shall be applicable in the case of any person receiving or eligible to receive annuity under the first sentence hereof and who has reached the age of 62 years."

(b) No annuity payment shall be made, as a result of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, for any period prior to January 1 of the year following the year in which this Act is enacted.

SEC. 5 Section 13(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2263(b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "A similar right to redetermination after deposit shall be applicable to an annuitant (1) whose annuity is based on an involuntary separation from the service, and (2) who is separated, on or after the date of enactment of this sentence, after a period of reemployment on a full-time basis which began before October 1, 1956."

SEC. 6. The third sentence of section 6(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2256(f)), is amended to read as follows: "Any Member who completes twenty years of service, or who attains the age of fifty years and shall have served in nine Congresses, or who attains the age of fifty-five years and completes fifteen years of service (at least ten years of which is service as a Member), shall, upon separation from the service (other than by resignation or expulsion), be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9."

SEC. 7. Section 6(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2256(d)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(d)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Any congressional employee who completes twenty years of service shall, upon involuntary separation from service as a

congressional employee not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9."

SEC. 8. (a) The first sentence of section 9(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2259(b)), is amended by inserting "or former congressional employee," immediately following the words "congressional employee" where first appearing in such sentence.

(b) The second sentence of such section 9(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting "or former congressional employee," immediately following the words "congressional employee" where first appearing in such sentence;

(2) by inserting the word "and" immediately following "service," at the end of clause (1) thereof; and

(3) by striking out "and (3) has served as a congressional employee during the last eleven months of his civilian service".

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, resulting from the operation of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to interest earnings on special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, with respect to employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and with respect to certain other categories of persons subject to such act, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BOGGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL BY THE ACQUISITION OF WET LANDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to House bill 7391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. McGEE, Mr. SCHOEPEL and Mr. BUTLER the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AID TO FEDERALLY IMPACTED SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2393) to extend for 1 year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, and to provide for the application of such laws to American Samoa, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2393, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 7, 1961, the name of Mr. Moss was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2517) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide more effective means for bringing to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators) on September 7, 1961.

PROPOSED COINAGE OF GOLD MEDAL IN HONOR OF SPEAKER RAYBURN — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 7, 1961, the names of Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BUTLER, BYRD of West Virginia, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CURTIS, DODD, ENGLE, FULBRIGHT, HART, HICKEY, HOLLAND, JACKSON, JAVITS, JOHNSTON, JORDAN, KEATING, KEFAUVER, LONG of Missouri, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MONRONEY, MORTON, MOSS, MUSKIE, PELL, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 133) to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. KERR) on September 7, 1961.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

Editorial entitled "A Crusader for Education Now Views the Harvest," written by Oliver Emmerich and published in the Jack-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

CONTENTS

Issued September 13, 1961
For actions of September 12, 1961
87th-1st, No. 159

Appropriations.....	1,17,20
Area redevelopment.....	1
ASC committees.....	5
Civil defense.....	1,30
Education.....	16
Electrification.....	19
Farm housing.....	1
Farm labor.....	6
Farm program.....	31
Feed grains.....	8,18
Food reserve.....	1,22
Foreign affairs.....	7
Foreign aid.....	24
Forestry.....	15
Grain relocation.....	1
Holiday.....	25
Lands.....	26
Legislative program.....	20
Livestock.....	21
Minerals.....	14
Peanuts.....	23

Personnel.....	2,5,9
Price supports.....	23
Purchasing.....	4
Reclamation.....	13
Research.....	1
Retirement.....	5
Salaries and expenses....	1
Soil conservation.....	1
Supergrades.....	2
Tariff.....	29
Taxation.....	28
Transportation.....	12
Water compacts.....	11
Water conservation.....	1
Wetlands.....	3
Wheat.....	27
Wools.....	29
Youth conservation.....	10

HIGHLIGHTS: House committees reported supplemental appropriation bill and additional-supergrades bill. Senate committees reported: Additional-supergrades bill. Youth Conservation Corps bill. Delaware River Basin compact bill. Sen. Keating criticized and Sens. Proxmire and Humphrey and Rep. Fountain and Smith, Iowa, commended feed grains program. Senate agreed to conference report on Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Rep. Coad objected to appointment of conferees on Mexican farm labor bill. House debated public works and conference report on State-Justice appropriation bills. Sen. Neuberger and others introduced and Sen. Neuberger and Reps. Breeding and May discussed wheat bills.

HOUSE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 9169, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 (H. Rept. 1175) (p. 18028). The bill includes the following items for the Farmers Home Administration: (1) Farm Housing Grants and Loans as authorized by Public Law 87-70, which amends the Housing Act of 1949, \$10,000,000 (same as budget estimate); (2) additional amount for Salaries and Expenses, \$1,000,000 (budget estimate, \$2,400,000) including \$125,000 (budget estimate, \$250,000) for farm housing research; and (3) a language proposal making not to exceed \$8,000,000 of the \$37,500,000 contingency authorization for farm operation loans provided in the 1962 Agricultural Appropriation Act available for Soil and Water Conservation Loans (budget estimate did not earmark any specific portion of the contingency authorization).

The Committee recommended that the budget estimate of \$47,200,000 for a new appropriation "Emergency Relocation of Grain" be denied, commenting as follows:

"Civil defense: Emergency relocation of grain.--The Committee recommends that the \$47,200,000 request to relocate wheat from current storage sites to locations close to metropolitan areas be denied. This proposal to store unmilled wheat which is unusable in that form deserves further study. Substantial sums have already been provided for civil defense including \$27,800,000 in a recent bill for an emergency survival food program."

The bill also includes under the Department of Commerce a supplemental appropriation estimate for fiscal year 1962 for the Area Redevelopment Administration, including \$5,500,000 (budget estimate, \$11,000,000) for administrative expenses, including technical services, of the Department of Commerce and delegate agencies.

The bill also includes under the Department of Labor a supplemental appropriation estimate for expenses necessary to carry into effect sections 16 (occupational training) and 17 (retraining subsistence payments) of the Area Redevelopment Act, including grants or reimbursements to States, of \$14,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available for occupational training and retraining payments to unemployed and underemployed individuals in redevelopment areas.

The Committee denied a Commerce Department request for \$1 million additional funds for Federal participation in the Century 21 Exposition.

Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7371, the State-Justice appropriation bill, and began action on amendments in disagreement. pp. 17950-4

Began debate on H. R. 9076, the public works appropriation bill. pp. 17962-8004, 18009-11.

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Saylor, providing that no part of the funds appropriated shall be available for conducting a survey of pump-back storage. p. 17993

By Rep. Jensen, 114 to 135, to strike out provisions for the construction of certain power lines on the Upper Colorado River project. pp. 17994-8001

2. SUPERGRADES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7377, to increase the limitation on the number of supergrades, and on the number of research and development positions of scientists and engineers for which special rates of pay are authorized (H. Rept. 1170). p. 18028

3. WETLANDS. ~~Passed with amendments H. R. 8520, to limit financial and technical assistance for drainage of certain wetlands. pp. 17954-7~~

The "Daily Digest" states that "Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate and House-passed versions of H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory birds by the acquisition of wetlands." p. D841

4. PURCHASING. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8741, to authorize any Federal agency to waive performance and payment bonds (H. Rept. 1173). p. 18028

5. PERSONNEL. Conferees were appointed on S. 739, to remove the present requirement, contained in the Pay Act of 1960, that ASC county committee employees with past service purchase credit for such service within a two-year period from July 10, 1960, to modify the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, and to provide for permanent indefinite appropriations for the retirement fund. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 17950

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited).

CONTENTS

Issued September 15, 1961
For actions of September 14, 1961
87th-1st, No. 161

Appropriations...2,16,19,36
Civil defense.....43
Conservation.....24
Delaware River.....13
Education.....11,21
Employment.....40
Farm labor.....39
Farm program.....23
Farm tenancy.....29
Federal aid.....38
Fish flour.....6
Fisheries.....45
Food.....7
Food for peace.....20,27
Foreign aid.....19
Foreign trade...4,15,25,44
Forestry.....32
Health benefits.....9
Legislative program...8,22
Military construction...16
Military training.....40

Milk sanitation.....28
Monopolies.....30
Peace Corps.....1
Personnel.....17,33,42
Pesticides.....26
Postal rates.....5
Property.....34
Recreation.....31
Research.....29,32
Retirement.....17
River basins.....13
Steamship conferences...12
Supergrades.....42
Tariff.....4
Television.....10
Tobacco.....35
Transportation...12,41,46
Water compact.....37
Wetlands.....3
Wheat.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed Peace Corps bill. Senate committee reported Delaware River Basin compact bill.

HOUSE

1. PEACE CORPS. By a vote of 287 to 97, passed with amendments H. R. 7500, to establish the Peace Corps on a permanent basis. pp. 18311-55, 18374
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 8072, the D. C. appropriation bill. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18356
3. WETLANDS. Received the conference report on H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by authorizing the Interior Department to acquire wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat (H. Rept. 1184). p. 18356
4. FOREIGN TRADE. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8465, to prohibit the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of articles imported from Cuba (H. Rept. 1182). p. 18397
The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 9189, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and (with amendments) H. R. 5193, to impose import taxes on led and zinc. p. D854
Several Representatives discussed the escape clause provision of the Trade Agreements Act. pp. 18386-90

5. POSTAL RATES. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7927, to adjust postal rates. p. 18397
6. FISH FLOUR. Rep. Pike discussed the use of fish flour, saying, "Let us untie the hands of American industry and reap the bountiful harvest of the sea for the benefit of the hungry of the world." pp. 18390-1
7. FOOD. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the review of enforcement and certification activities of the Food and Drug Administration. p. 18396
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack inserted a statement, "Status of Kennedy Legislative Program." p. 18360
9. HEALTH BENEFITS. Rep. Lesinski inserted an article about the Blue Cross program available to Federal employees under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act. p. 18360
10. TELEVISION. Rep. Stratton discussed the effect of the proposed elimination of certain VHF channels on rural areas, and inserted an article, "TV Switch to VHF Would Hurt Area." pp. 18377-8
11. EDUCATION. Rep. Wilson, Ind., inserted an article, "School Bill Worries President." pp. 18361-2

SENATE

12. TRANSPORTATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 6775, to extend the authority for dual rate agreements by steamship conferences (pp. 18227-54). Conferees were appointed (p. 18254).
Agreed to the following amendments:
 - By Sen. Kefauver, to strike out Sec. 1 of the bill which would have amended the third paragraph of Sec. 14 of the Shipping Act of 1916 to insert the word "unjustly" before the word "discriminating" so as to conform that section to all other portions of the Shipping Act. pp. 18227
 - By Sen. Kefauver, to extend the right to petition against unreasonable rates to municipalities which operate ports and port authorities. pp. 18229-30
 - By Sen. Kefauver, to provide that any contract, amendment, or modification of any contract not permitted by the Federal Maritime Commission shall be unlawful, and contracts, amendments, and modifications shall be lawful only when and as long as permitted by the Commission. pp. 18228-9
 - By Sen. Kefauver, to provide that the Federal Maritime Commission shall disapprove any conference rate, fare, or charge which after hearing it finds to be so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the U. S. pp. 18248-9
 - By Sen. Kefauver, to strike out Sec. 6 of the bill which would have permitted carriers to solicit information regarding the activities of shippers in order to enforce their dual rate agreements. pp. 18249-50
 - By Sen. Schoeppel, to modify the bulk cargo provisions so as to give the Commission more discretion in determining whether or not dual-rate contracts should apply to less than shipload amounts of liquid bulk cargo which are not chemicals. p. 18250
Rejected the following amendments:
 - By Sen. Kefauver, 28 to 54, to strike out a phrase providing that agreements shall not be approved between conferences of carriers serving

ACQUISITION OF WETLANDS AND OTHER WATERFOWL HABITAT

SEPTEMBER 14, 1961.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BONNER, from the committee of conference, submitted the
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7391]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *seven-year period*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *\$105,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *1969*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *seven-year period*, ; and the Senate agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
GALE W. MCGEE,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the House bill provided for authorization of appropriations of not to exceed \$150 million for the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 for the acquisition of wet lands and other waterfowl habitat. Seventy-five percent of such funds, after the 10-year period, were to be repaid to the Government out of the proceeds of the migratory bird conservation stamps.

The Senate bill reduced the time limit to 5 years and the authorization to \$50 million, with a provision that 90 percent be repaid out of migratory bird conservation funds. In addition, the Senate bill provided that land acquisitions could be made in States only with the approval of the Governor or appropriate agencies of the States.

The Senate accepted the House provision for 75 percent repayment and the House accepted the Senate provision with respect to the necessity for State approval prior to land acquisition.

With respect to the fund authorization, it was the sense of the conference that the authorization should be for a 7-year period in the amount of \$105 million.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

employees with past service purchase credit for such service within a two-year period from July 10, 1960, to modify the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, and to provide for permanent indefinite appropriations for the retirement fund. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 19716-7

33. WETLANDS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. p. 19778
34. CONSUMERS. Sen. Hart discussed the need for a consumer counsel, saying, "No reason occurs to me why we should not now have a Presidential Consumer Counsel." pp. 19793-6
35. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to limit to one hour's debate on Mon. the conference report on H. R. 6775, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences. pp. 19782-3, 19788
36. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the supplemental appropriation bill will be taken up on Mon. or Tues. pp. 19758, 19772-3
37. ADJOURNED until Mon., Sept. 25. p. 19803

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

38. TEXTILES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Cotton inserting an address before the Wool Manufacturers' Council expressing concern over the effects of imports on the wool manufacturing industry. p. A7593
Extension of remarks of Rep. Lane inserting the statement of William F. Sullivan, president, Northern Textile Association on problems of the industry. pp. A7632-3
39. FOREST PRODUCTS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley stating that "it is essential that we undertake new efforts to further develop -- and, as necessary, expand -- local, State, and Federal efforts to conserve our forests," and inserting an article, "There Is No Surplus Of Forest Products." pp. A7602-3
40. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Kyl inserting an address by Rep. Nelsen criticizing the feed grains program and saying "Let's leave political ping-pong out of the farm game ..." pp. A7603-5
Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel inserting an editorial, "Billion-Dollar Bust," suggesting that this Department's Sept. crop report indicates that the feed grain program "has turned out to be a costly fizzle." pp. A7637-8
Extension of remarks of Rep. Marshall inserting an address before the national plowing contest, "The Land, God's Greatest Gift To Man," and stating that it is a major statement on national agricultural policy. pp. A7644-6
Extension of remarks of Rep. MacGregor inserting correspondence dealing with the resignation of Donald Willette as chairman of the Minn. ASC Committee and stating that it "clearly indicates the nature of the unsavory situation requiring this resignation and provides still another concrete illustration of the 'politics first' character of this administration." p. A7654
41. COTTON. Extension of remarks of Rep. Norrell inserting an article favoring an increase in acreage for the 1962 crop of cotton. p. A7613

42. WILDERNESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Aspinall inserting a letter to the editor opposing the proposed wilderness bill. p. A7614
43. FOOD FOR PEACE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Breeding inserting an article favoring the use of surplus commodities in a food for peace program. p. A7630
44. FISH FLOUR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Pike urging the development and use of fish flour for its high protein content. p. A7630
45. STOCKPILING. Extension of remarks of Rep. Laird inserting a telegram sent to the President urging a stockpile of dairy products protected from nuclear fallout. p. A7657
46. PERSONNEL; EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jensen urging enactment of legislation to reduce the number of Federal employees by 10% and thus reduce expenditures by "over a half billion dollars" annually. pp. A7660-1
47. EMPLOYMENT; CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Johnson, Calif., urging enactment of the proposed Youth Employment Opportunities Act. p. A7666
48. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Rhodes inserting a staff document of the Republican policy committee on the record of the 87th Congress, including the farm program. pp. A7668-72

BILLS INTRODUCED

49. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 2620, by Sen. Humphrey, to provide for United States participation in international programs of assistance which utilize agricultural commodities; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 19548-9
S. 2630, by Sen. Humphrey (for himself and Sen. Douglas), to establish a lending program to finance the processing and distribution of agricultural commodities; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of Sen. Humphrey. pp. 19705-10
50. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 9417, by Rep. Henderson, to impose an additional duty on strawberries and strawberry products; to Ways and Means Committee.
H. R. 9425, by Rep. Johnson, Calif., to amend paragraph 757 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to brazil nuts; to Ways and Means Committee.
S. Con. Res. 52, by Sen. Humphrey, establishing the Joint Committee on Export Trade; to Commerce Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 19445-8
51. LANDS; TIMBER. S. 2613, by Sen. Anderson (by request), to amend section 2 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 19436-7
52. SMALL BUSINESS. S. 2600, by Sen. Proxmire, to amend section 7 of the Small Business Act with respect to the maximum loan which can be made to any one borrower; to Banking and Currency Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 19433-4
53. PATENTS. S. 2601, by Sen. Wiley (by request), to establish a uniform national policy concerning rights to inventions under contracts with the U. S. Government; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 19434-5
54. EXTENSION WORK. S. 2604, by Sen. Carlson, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in 1962 commemorating the centennial of the Morrill Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Pont must totally surrender its GM shares was published, Du Pont stock quickly sank from 229½ to 212.

I read now from the Louisville (Ky.) Times of May 29:

Du Pont and General Motors were affected last week by a Supreme Court decision that Du Pont must divest itself of the 63 million GM shares it owns. That action caused Du Pont to drop from 220 to 210 and GM to fall from 48¾ to 44¾ last week.

Mr. President, perhaps many Senators do not realize the delicacy of the stock market. But a 10-point drop in the market quotation of the Du Pont stock, with its 45 million shares outstanding, would result in a \$450 million depreciation; and a 4-point drop in the market quotation of General Motors stock would result in a drop of nearly \$1 billion. Certainly such changes do have a serious effect on those who may be forced to sell the stock at that time, and at the same time there is a definite effect on the general economy of the country.

Furthermore, these declines in the market will have a serious effect on the general revenue of the U.S. Government. This point cannot be overemphasized.

Mr. President, I read from other newspaper accounts:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 9]

General Motors, the second most active stock, advanced 1½ to 46¾ on volume of 64,300 shares, and Du Pont climbed 2¾ to 218½ in less active trading. Security analysts said the strength in both was due to talk about tax relief for Du Pont divestiture of GM stock.

And on July 15, from the Associated Press:

The stock market rebounded sharply Friday recovering some of this week's sharp losses. Perhaps the most heartening news was that proposals are being studied in Washington to ease the tax bite on the scheduled divestiture by Du Pont of its 63 million shares of General Motors. The U.S. Supreme Court decision this year that Du Pont must rid itself of this stock—worth in the neighborhood of \$3 billion—was a blow to the market. Prospects of easing this situation, therefore, were mightily encouraging. Du Pont advanced 5¾ to 221.

[From the Associated Press, July 19]

A highlight of the session was an early 7-point rise by Du Pont. The stock held a closing gain of only 1¾. A favorable response was evoked by news that legislation had been introduced to give a tax break to shareholders who would receive the 63 million shares of General Motors owned by Du Pont pursuant to the Supreme Court order that this GM stock must be distributed. At the same time Du Pont's 3 months' earnings were described yesterday as showing less of a decline than anticipated.

Mr. President, I have before me a whole series of such articles. Whenever a speech on this subject is made on the floor of the Senate the market quotation of the stock may fluctuate between \$3 and \$5 a share. After the House passed the bill the other evening the stock advanced \$4.50 the following day; and when the Finance Committee acted the stock market quotation on the stock advanced again. When the Senator from Tennessee threatened to make his filibuster to block action on the bill at this session the stock market declined.

In order to keep the Members of

Congress or the executive branch from being subject to the suspicion that they may be manipulating the stock markets let us vote the bill either up or down before this session of Congress adjourns. Let the Court, the company officials, and the Treasury Department know what will be the law under which they will have to submit or approve a plan by December 2.

I repeat—the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, Mr. Knight, yesterday afternoon said he certainly hoped Congress would decide this question at this session. It is my understanding that the Department of Justice feels likewise although they were not suggesting what position Congress should take—for that is for Congress to decide. It is agreed that it is important that the decision be made in advance of December 2, not next January. That point cannot be overemphasized; it completely refutes the argument for delay that is being advanced by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks at this time, because the Senator from Oklahoma desires to speak on this same question.

I shall ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the excerpts from financial papers concerning the manner in which the markets have been influenced by reports of court actions and the various decisions which have been made in the Congress throughout the preceding months be printed in the RECORD.

These articles further emphasize how important it is that Congress take affirmative action at this time. This is important to protect not only the stockholders, but also the securities market generally. I hope, now that it has been decided that Congress will remain here next week, that we can make a final decision on this matter.

In the testimony given before the committee it was pointed out that the total trading of General Motors stock in preceding years has been approximately 9 million shares annually. If the company is forced to adopt a plan under which it will throw from 3 million to 6 million extra shares on the market annually for the next 10 years it will certainly disrupt the market. Why should the stockholders of General Motors who are in no way involved in this case, be penalized by having the value of their securities destroyed?

Why should the stockholders of the Du Pont Co., whom the court itself described as innocent victims, be penalized?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Associated Press, July 20]

Du Pont, which has been up or down recently depending on the latest report from Washington about how the tax question will be handled in its spinoff of 63 million shares of General Motors, fell more than 2 points. The newest report was that the Justice Department doesn't like the idea of easing the tax bite on shareholders.

[From the Associated Press, July 25]

Du Pont kept more than a point of an early gain exceeding 2 points as it responded to news that the U.S. Treasury has agreed

to go along with a bill to give a tax break to Du Pont shareholders in the spinoff of General Motors stock owned by the chemical giant. GM, which was off fractionally at the start, recovered, rising three-eighths to 46½ on successive blocks of 3,000 and 2,000 shares.

[From the Associated Press, Aug. 2]

Du Pont jumped 6¾. Strength in Du Pont was attributed in some quarters to belief a favorable announcement may be forthcoming regarding the chemical firm's forced spinoff of its huge block of General Motors shares.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 4]

Du Pont jumped 6¼ in a stronger chemical group, apparently still reflecting Street hopes that legislation may be pushed through easing the tax bite on stockholders who receive the GM shares it must get rid of.

[From the Associated Press, Aug. 15]

Du Pont had a mild sinking spell, dropping more than two points amid renewed publicity concerning possible means of disposing of its huge holdings of General Motors as ordered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

[From the Associated Press, Aug. 31]

A jump of 5¼ by Du Pont followed a published report that favorable committee action was expected on a bill to ease the tax bite in future distribution of Du Pont's huge holdings of General Motors stock.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 2]

Du Pont fell 3½. The company filed a proposed judgment in Chicago providing for divestiture of its 63 million shares of General Motors stock by distribution to stockholders or such other means as it may select. The House Ways and Means Committee is considering a bill that would ease the tax impact on shareholder distributions. The company has said that unless such a bill is approved a stockholder distribution would not be made. Yesterday's decline was said to reflect fears over the outcome of congressional action.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 8]

A jump of 3¾ in Du Pont was solely responsible for the rise in industrials. House Ways and Means Committee approval of a bill that would ease the tax impact on Du Pont shareholders of any distribution to them of the company's General Motors stock was credited with the pronounced strength in the issue.

[From the Associated Press, Sept. 15]

Du Pont fell back again amid belief there may be no legislation in this session to ease the tax bite on shareholders from distribution of GM stock.

[From the Associated Press, Sept. 20]

Du Pont spurted more than 4 points on news that the House had adopted a bill which would give tax relief to Du Pont stockholders in the future distribution of Du Pont's holdings of General Motors.

[From the Associated Press, Sept. 22]

The stock market slipped a little lower in moderately active trading early today. A 2-point drop by Union Carbide and a fall of more than a point by Du Pont were conspicuous. Overnight news that a filibuster is being planned against the bill to provide tax relief for Du Pont's shareholders when that company's holdings of General Motors stock are distributed was a discouraging element.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the provisions of H.R. 8847. It is my belief that this proposed legislation should be enacted, and should be enacted at this time.

Many letters from people in my State who are small holders of stock in the

companies in question, and also from people who are interested in trusts, many of them small trusts, state the tax provisions of this order for divestiture constitute an arbitrary appropriation of their property. There has been an expressed belief on the part of some that this administration is opposed to business. This administration is not opposed to business, and the record so proves.

I believe the proposed legislation would be further proof of that fact, if passed. Therefore, as mentioned, I hope the proposed legislation will become law at this session.

Mr. KERR. I thank the majority leader. I shall not ask for a ye-and-nay vote, either in support of what I have to say about the minority views or what I have to say in favor of the bill.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL BY ACQUISITION OF WETLANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was hoping that this afternoon I could bring up a conference report. I have checked with the leadership on both sides. The conference report is on the so-called migratory waterfowl by acquisition of wetlands bill. For the information of any Senator that has any opposition or anything to say about the conference report, I announce to the Senate that I intend to do so. We will bring it up this afternoon.

Mr. KERR. How long does the Senator anticipate consideration of the conference report will require?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not need more than 2 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of September 14, 1961, p. 18356, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

at this point in the RECORD a statement of the conferees explaining what the conference arrived at. The report was unanimously agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the House bill provided for authorization of appropriations of not to exceed \$150 million for the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 for the acquisition of wet lands and other waterfowl habitat. Seventy-five percent of such funds, after the 10-year period, were to be repaid to the Government out of the proceeds of the migratory bird conservation stamps.

The Senate bill reduced the time limit to 5 years and the authorization to \$50 million, with a provision that 90 percent be repaid out of migratory bird conservation funds. In addition, the Senate bill provided that land acquisitions could be made in States only with the approval of the Governor or appropriate agencies of the States.

The Senate accepted the House provision for 75-percent repayment and the House accepted the Senate provision with respect to the necessity for State approval prior to land acquisition.

With respect to the fund authorization, it was the sense of the conference that the authorization should be for a 7-year period in the amount of \$105 million.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9118) to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the conference report on H.R. 9118, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. The report was unanimously agreed to by the conferees on the part of the Senate. As is the case with all conference reports, it represents a

compromise between the views of the Senate and House conferees.

The great majority of changes were minor drafting changes and do not warrant taking the time of the Senate to explain in detail. I might mention that the conferees agreed to call the Agency the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the act itself the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. Throughout the bill, references to "disarmament" are preceded by the words "arms control" as proposed by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The highly technical patent provision—section 32—was rewritten by the conferees. The language agreed to is based upon the language now in the act expanding and extending the saline water conversion program, which was agreed to by both the Senate and the House last week.

The difference between the two bills that kept the conferees in session for almost a day and a half was the one involving the position of the new agency within the executive branch. The Senate will recall that the bill as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations provided that the Agency be established within the Department of State, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of State. The House version provided for a separate agency. The language worked out by the conferees will, I believe, be satisfactory to the Senate. Although it is no longer specified that the Agency shall be established within the Department of State, the Secretary of State is given direction over the activities of the Agency. Section 22 states that the Agency shall be headed by a Director "who shall serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of State and the President on arms control and disarmament matters." The Secretary of State is mentioned deliberately ahead of the President to establish the line of authority which is intended to run through, and not around, the Secretary of State to the President. The next sentence in that section reads as follows:

In carrying out his duties under this Act the Director shall, under the direction of the Secretary of State, have primary responsibility within the Government for arms control and disarmament matters, as defined in the act.

The managers on the part of the Senate attach great weight to the phrase "under the direction of the Secretary of State." These words are meant to insure against any usurpation of the powers and responsibilities of the Secretary of State in the field of arms control and disarmament.

Further on, in section 25, it is again provided that only "under the direction of the Secretary of State" may the Director establish bureaus, offices, and so forth. Again, in section 34(a) the direction of the Secretary of State is required for the negotiation of agreements and communication with representatives of other nations and international organizations. In section 41(a) the intent is expressed that "the Director rely upon the Department of State for gen-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

CONTENTS

Issued September 26, 1961
For actions of September 25, 1961
87th-1st, No. 170

Appropriations.....	6,2,11,12,22
Centennial.....	21
Civil defense.....	25
Corn.....	15
Farm labor.....	8
Farm loans.....	5
Feed grains.....	3
Fish flour.....	10
Foreign affairs.....	9
Lands.....	20
Legislative program.....	11
Milk standards.....	4
Nutrition.....	19
Organization.....	19,25
Peace Corps.....	23
Personnel.....	18
Postal rates.....	17
Potatoes.....	7
Public works.....	12
Purchasing.....	2
Reclamation.....	14
Reorganization.....	25
Retirement.....	18
Saline water.....	24
Steamship conferences.....	1
Supplemental appropriations.....	6
Transportation.....	1
Water rights.....	20
Waterways.....	16
Wetlands.....	13

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on public works appropriation bill. Sen. Keating criticized feed grains program. Sens. Javits, Keating, and Proxmire debated merits of milk sanitation legislation. Sen. Kuchel introduced and discussed water rights bill.

SENATE

1. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6775, to extend the authority for dual rate agreements by steamship conferences. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 19861-8
2. PURCHASING. Passed without amendment H. R. 8099, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the General Supply Fund. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19854
3. FEED GRAINS. Sen. Keating referred to a report that a golf course in Nebr. received payments under the feed grain program for taking land out of production and stated that "This new incident is just another in a series of unfortunate events. The feed grain program has been terrifically expensive, and it has not cut down production, which was what it was intended to do." p. 19817
4. MILK STANDARDS. Sens. Javits and Keating expressed opposition to enactment of legislation to provide for national milk sanitation standards and contended that New York State had adequate standards for the inspection of milk. Sen. Proxmire disagreed and contended that the proposed legislation would benefit both the consumers and dairy farmers of New York. pp. 19871-2

5. FARM LOANS. Sen. Stennis commended the program of the Farmers Home Administration, reviewed the results of its work in Mississippi, and stated, "This outstanding agency of government is engaged in one of the great programs for helping young people get the proper financing they need to become established on family-size farms ... offers opportunities for farmowners to develop their farms into efficient farm management units ... aids them to make the best possible use of the available resources by developing their lands and acquiring dwellings and essential farm service buildings." pp. 19872-3
6. APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Prouty objected to a unanimous consent request by Sen. Mansfield for consideration of H. R. 9169, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1962. p. 19816
7. POTATOES. Received a resolution from the Oregon-California Potato Committee which administers Marketing Order No. 59 urging that the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 be amended to delete the present exemption for canned and frozen potato products. p. 19806
8. FARM LABOR. Sen. Proxmire urged the President to veto the Mexican farm labor bill. p. 19816
9. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Sparkman and others discussed the results of the recent meetings of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Monetary Fund. pp. 19846-54
10. FISH FLOUR. Sen. Pell inserted several items discussing the possible uses of a new product, fish flour. pp. 19873-5
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the supplemental appropriation bill will be considered today, Sept. 26. pp. 19869, 19876

HOUSE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 9076, the public works appropriation bill for 1962 (H. Rept. 1268). pp. 19934-42
13. WETLANDS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7391, to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19904

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor discussing the Federal reclamation program, and saying, "A Federal reclamation program, with proper investigation, planning, and construction, is a sound investment in national progress." pp. A7707-8
15. CORN. Extension of remarks of Sen. Douglas inserting an article, "Project Corn Tassel." p. A7708
16. WATERWAYS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Boykin inserting an address, "Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Project." pp. A7717-8
17. POSTAL RATES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Goodling discussing postal rates and saying, "Before raising rates it might be desirable to conduct a mental survey and determine to what extent each of us is responsible for the huge annual postal deficit." p. A7734

1934, under which the Commission was created.

The Commission administers five acts; namely, the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. The General objective of all of these statutes is to protect the public and investors against fraud and manipulation in the securities markets, and other malpractices in these markets which were rampant during the roaring 1920's.

Commissioner Cohen is eminently qualified to carry out the duties and responsibilities of his office. He has been an employee of the Commission for the past 19 years, starting as a junior attorney in 1942, and occupying successively higher positions. From 1952 to 1959, he was Chief Counsel of the Division of Corporation Finance. He then was promoted to the position of Adviser to the Commission, and in July 1960, he became the Director of the Division of Corporation Finance. He is an outstanding expert in the work of the Commission.

In 1956, Mr. Cohen was awarded the Rockefeller Public Service Award by the trustees of Princeton University which enabled him to go to Europe to study the capital markets, the processes of capital formation and governmental control over these activities in several foreign countries. This year, he was honored with the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the President made such an excellent appointment to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, at page 19630 of the RECORD, I made some remarks in debate on the conference report on the supergrades bill. Evidently there was a printing error and some type has been mixed up in the printing of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to read as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the committee with the gentleman from Georgia. There is not a harder working member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service than the gentleman from Georgia. He has tried hard to keep these supergrades down. Personally, I am against supergrades. I do not think they belong in our classified employees setup. A lot of people say that we need them to bring some professional brainpower into the Government. The fact is that the majority of these jobs are handpicked for employees already in the classified civil service, and it simply gives them an increase in salary. So with these supergrades, what we are doing is taking care of our present employees. This is simply an increase in the salary schedule. The rank and file workers are left out in the cold by the Congress. We ought to realize that is what we are doing by paying these higher salaries in a majority of cases to people who are already employees of the Federal Government and are already receiving rather fancy salaries in the higher brackets.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request to make concerning the procedure of the House. I ask unanimous consent that the action by which clause 2 of rule XXVIII was suspended a week ago last Saturday be revoked, and that clause 2, rule XXVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives be restored.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard briefly on my reasons for so doing.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members well know, suspension of clause 2, rule XXVIII, provides for the consideration of a conference report when it is reported to the House. I agreed a week ago last Saturday and offered no objection to suspension of that provision of the rule for the reason, I thought, that by not objecting the business of the House during the past week would be expedited. But if this session is to continue interminably, I think the Members of the House ought to know what the remaining conference reports contain. I would call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that a conference report was called up on the floor of the House last week in which I was vitally interested, and the Members of the House, I am sure, were vitally interested, but I doubt that very many of them knew and I did not know when the report was called up what the conference report contained. By asking questions, I failed to elicit correct information because the gentleman, who was recognized to hurriedly present the conference report did not know precisely what the conference report contained. The result was that the House was given information that was not in accord with the facts. I do not blame the gentleman in charge of the bill. I blame the procedure which is in effect and which permits the forced draft consideration of bills when there is no valid reason for so doing.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no business before the House this week that calls for the setting aside of clause 2 of rule XXVIII which is for the protection of the Members of the House to know what these conference reports contain.

Mr. Speaker, the deficiency appropriation bill coming up, as now pending before the other body, contains over a billion dollars or an increase of almost half a billion dollars over the bill which the House approved. I certainly want, and I would hope the other Members of the House would want to know why this deficiency appropriation bill has been increased by a half billion dollars. I do not want to see that bill considered nor do I want to see the foreign aid appropriations bill, dealing with billions of dollars, considered without ample notice to the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason I have asked unanimous consent that clause 2, rule XXVIII, be restored with full force and effect.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we sincerely hope that Members handling conference reports will cooperate in advising the House as to any changes that have been made in House bills. The procedure about which the gentleman is talking is the one generally used toward the end of sessions of Congress. Of course, it is necessary for the expeditious handling of the business leading to adjournment of the House as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now that we have turned the corner, going into another week, does the gentleman mean that the pressure is so great as of today and for the remainder of this week that we cannot consider conference reports on the basis of having them printed so that all Members may read them and know what has transpired as between the House and the other body?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the fact that we are entering into another week is not the main point at issue. Members for several days have appealed to me that they have business to attend to and speaking engagements in their districts this week. The procedure by which the handling of these matters may be expedited is not only an accommodation to individual Members, but is beneficial to the House of Representatives as a whole. I hope the gentleman will not pursue his unanimous consent request. I would like to cooperate with the gentleman in having matters thoroughly explained as they come from conference, but I would be constrained to object if the gentleman should pursue his request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any other way by which Members can be assured that they will know what is in the conference reports other than by having them printed and, thus, given an opportunity to see them before they are brought to the House floor? That is the orderly procedure and the only orderly procedure that I know of, and that is why I am sure that clause 2 was written in rule 28.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa can examine the bills that are passed by both Houses of the Congress and, thus, be alert to the possibilities with respect to any conference report.

The gentleman is a very astute and alert Member of this body and makes many contributions toward helping the House get information as to the content of bills and conference reports, but I would respectfully suggest that the gentleman withdraw his request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the circumstances the Chair declines to recognize the gentleman from Iowa to submit the request.

ACQUISITION OF WETLANDS AND ESSENTIAL WATERFOWL HABITAT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this is about?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. The House passed the bill providing \$150 million over a 10-year period and 75 percent of the moneys taken in by the duck stamps and other funds of that nature were to be applied to the repayment of this money. The Senate reduced it to \$50 million, and a 5-year period with the provision that the governors of the States would have to acquiesce to the taking of this land, and also carrying a provision that the funds from the duck stamps and other moneys taken in over this 5-year period be applied to this \$50 million.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of September 14, 1961.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, are there special orders for today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They will not be called yet. There is one matter pending. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] has a conference report on elections in the District of Columbia.

ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 8444) to amend the act of August 12, 1955, relating to elections in the District of Columbia:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1266)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8444) to amend the Act of August 12, 1955, relating to elections in the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do

recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes', approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699; title I, ch. 11, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended as follows:

"(1) The first section is amended by inserting after the word 'That' the words 'in the District of Columbia electors of President and Vice President of the United States and'.

"(2) Section 3 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1103), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The said Commissioners shall from time to time designate the Chairman of the Board.'

"(3) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1105), is amended by striking out 'permanent'.

"(4) Paragraph 3 of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1105), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) provide for recording and counting votes by means of ballots or machines or both and not less than five days before each election held pursuant to this Act, publish in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the District a copy of the official ballot to be used in any such election;".

"(5) Section 5 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1105), is further amended (A) by striking from the first sentence of subsection (b) 'The Board, and persons authorized by it' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Each member of the Board and persons authorized by the Board', and by striking the period at the end of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ', including, a regulation permitting persons not absent from the District but who are physically unable to appear personally at an official registration place, to register in the manner prescribed in such regulation for the purpose of voting in any election held pursuant to this Act.'

"(6) Paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1105) are hereby renumbered as paragraphs (7) and (8) respectively, and a new paragraph inserted immediately after paragraph (5) as follows:

"(6) Develop and administer procedures for absentee registration for and voting in any election held under this Act by any person included within the categories referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 101 of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584).'

"(7) Section 6 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1106), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Board is authorized to adopt and use a seal."

"(8) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1107), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A person shall be entitled to vote in an election in the District of Columbia only if he is a qualified elector, and except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, he registers in the District during the year in which such election is to be held."

"(9) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 7 (b) of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C.

Code, sec. 1-1107), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) he executes a registration affidavit by signature or mark (unless prevented by physical disability) on the form prescribed by the Board pursuant to subsection (c) showing that he meets each of the requirements specified in section 2 (2) for a qualified elector or qualifies under procedures established by the Board under paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 5 of this Act, and, if he desires to vote in a party election, such form shall show his political party affiliation."

"(10) Section 7(c) of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1107), is amended by striking '(b) (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(b) (2)'."

"(11) The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1107), is amended to read as follows: 'The registry shall be open from January 1 until forty-five days before the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November during each presidential election year except the forty-five day period which ends on the first Tuesday in May, and except as provided by the Board in the case of a special election. The Board may close the registry on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.'

"(12) So much of subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1108), as precedes clause (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Candidates for office participating in an election of the officials referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first section of this Act and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section shall be the persons registered under section 7 of this Act who have been nominated for such office by a petition—"

"(13) Section 8 of such Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1108), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each political party who has had its candidate elected as President of the United States after January 1, 1950, shall be entitled to nominate candidates for presidential electors. The executive committee of the organization recognized by the national committee of each such party as the official organization of that party in the District of Columbia shall nominate by appropriate means the presidential electors for that party. Nominations shall be made by message to the Board of Elections on or before September 1 next preceding a presidential election.

"(e) The names of the candidates of each political party for President and Vice President shall be placed on the ballot under the title and device, if any, of that party as designated by the duly authorized committee of the organization recognized by the national committee of that party as the official organization of that party in the District. The form of the ballot shall be determined by the Board. The position on the ballot of names of candidates for President and Vice President shall be determined by lot. The names of persons nominated as candidates for electors of President and Vice President shall not appear on the ballot.

"(f) A political party which does not qualify under subsection (d) of this section may have the names of its candidates for President and Vice President of the United States printed on the general election ballot provided a petition nominating the appropriate number of candidates for presidential electors signed by at least 5 per centum of registered qualified electors of the District of Columbia, as of July 1 of the year in which the election is to be held is presented to the Board on or before August 15 preceding the date of the presidential election.

"(g) No person may be elected to the office of elector of President and Vice President pursuant to this Act unless (1) he is



Public Law 87-383
87th Congress, H. R. 7391
October 4, 1961

An Act

75 STAT. 813.

To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the seven-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed \$105,000,000.

Migratory water-
fowl.
Conservation.

Appropriation
authorization.

SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for purposes of the migratory bird conservation fund established pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 451; 16 U.S.C. 718d).

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1969, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum of the moneys accruing annually to such fund: *Provided*, That in the event the full amount authorized by section 1 of this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid seven-year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall begin with the next full fiscal year: *Provided further*, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the Governor of the State or appropriate State agency.

State approval.

Approved October 4, 1961.

